

Dudley Knox Library, NPS
Monterey, CA 93943

NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL

Monterey, California



THESIS

THE IMPACT OF THE DEMONSTRATION PROJECT ON
MANAGERS AT THE NAVAL WEAPONS CENTER, CHINA LAKE

by

Yvonne E. Williams

June 1983

Thesis Advisor:

W. R. Bishop

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited

T208963

| REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE | | READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM |
|---|-----------------------|--|
| 1. REPORT NUMBER | 2. GOVT ACCESSION NO. | 3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER |
| 4. TITLE (and Subtitle) The Impact of the Demonstration Project on Managers at the Naval Weapons Center, China Lake | | 5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED Master's Thesis June 1983 |
| | | 6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER |
| 7. AUTHOR(s) Yvonne E. Williams | | 8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s) |
| 9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, California 93940 | | 10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS |
| 11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, California 93940 | | 12. REPORT DATE June 1983 |
| | | 13. NUMBER OF PAGES 128 |
| 14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office) | | 15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) |
| | | 15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE |
| 16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Approved for public release; distribution unlimited | | |
| 17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report) | | |
| 18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES | | |
| 19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Personnel Management, Civil Service Reform Act, Demonstration Project, Performance Evaluation, Performance-Based Pay | | |
| 20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) A Demonstration Project authorized under the Civil Service Reform Act of 1978 was developed and implemented at the Naval Weapons Center, China Lake and the Naval Ocean Systems Center, San Diego. The Project was designed to increase the participation of line managers in the personnel management function, and to establish a direct link between pay and performance evalua- tion. This paper contains a study of managerial opinions and attitudes toward the Demonstration Project. Managerial survey data, analysis, and | | |

BLOCK 20. ABSTRACT (Continued)

conclusions are presented, and a cost/effectiveness model is developed based on data obtained after two full-year cycles under the Project.

Approved for public release, distribution unlimited

The Impact of the Demonstration Project on
Managers at the Naval Weapons Center, China Lake

by

Yvonne E. Williams

B.S., University of Southern Mississippi, 1978

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE IN MANAGEMENT

from the

NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL
June 1983

ABSTRACT

A Demonstration Project authorized under the Civil Service Reform Act of 1978 was developed and implemented at the Naval Weapons Center, China Lake and the Naval Ocean Systems Center, San Diego. The Project was designed to increase the participation of line managers in the personnel management function, and to establish a direct link between pay and performance evaluation.

This paper contains a study of managerial opinions and attitudes toward the Demonstration Project. Managerial survey data, analysis, and conclusions are presented, and a cost/effectiveness model is developed based on data obtained after two full-year cycles under the Project.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | | |
|------|--|-----|
| I. | OBJECTIVES OF THE DEMONSTRATION PROJECT | 6 |
| | A. BACKGROUND | 8 |
| | B. IMPLEMENTATION | 12 |
| | C. SYSTEM MECHANICS | 13 |
| II. | LITERATURE REVIEW | 20 |
| | A. RELEVANT THEORIES | 20 |
| | B. ALTERNATE APPROACHES TO PERFORMANCE EVALUATION | 23 |
| | C. DISCUSSION | 27 |
| III. | NATURE OF THE PROBLEM | 29 |
| IV. | THE RESEARCH METHOD | 32 |
| | A. HYPOTHESES | 32 |
| | B. SURVEY DEVELOPMENT | 34 |
| | C. CONTENT ANALYSIS PROCEDURE | 35 |
| V. | SURVEY RESULTS AND DISCUSSION | 39 |
| VI. | CONCLUSIONS | 45 |
| | APPENDIX A: SAMPLE QUESTIONNAIRE | 50 |
| | APPENDIX B: COMPUTER DATA/TABLES | 67 |
| | LIST OF REFERENCES | 123 |
| | BIBLIOGRAPHY | 125 |
| | INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST | 126 |

I. OBJECTIVES OF THE DEMONSTRATION PROJECT

The Naval Weapons Center at China Lake, California, is currently participating in a joint Demonstration Project in cooperation with the Naval Ocean Systems Center, San Diego, California. The Project was authorized by the Civil Service Reform Act of 1978, Title VI of the United States Code of Federal Regulations [Ref. 1]. To date, the Project is the only one in existence in the Federal Government, as approved by the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) under the Act. The objective for allowing such an experiment was to determine if removal or modification of some of the existing regulations affecting Federal civilian employment could facilitate increased efficiency and productivity.

Under existing Federal regulations, the functions of personnel recruitment, selection and promotion, position classification, and pay administration are closely controlled by detailed rules and procedures administered through personnel specialists assigned at each Federal agency. These personnelists are subject to periodic inspection by OPM auditors, and compliance with regulations is strictly enforced. Very little latitude is allowed in the application of these regulations to the personnel management functions at individual agencies. The real needs of line managers for the authority and autonomy to supervise their subordinates are

often overlooked by these inflexible regulations. This situation has fostered the development of a somewhat adversarial relationship between managers, who attempt to get the job done, and personnelists, who must constantly ensure that the rules are followed. The end result of this situation is counter-productive to increasing efficiency of human resources management at Federal activities. In recognition of this dilemma, the Act encouraged presentation of new ideas designed to minimize the internal conflicts at agencies over the personnel management functions which are actually the responsibility of line management to accomplish.

The intent of this Demonstration Project is to increase the participation of line managers in the personnel management function and to establish a direct link between pay and performance evaluation. The rationale for the former purpose is to decentralize the personnel management function, and to place it more directly in the hands of line managers, while the rationale for the latter purpose is to comply with the intent of the Act. Thus, the Project would attempt to meet the internal needs of the organization while also complying with external goals mandated by law. It was not known at the inception of the Project whether or not both of these ends could be successfully accomplished. The Project would be required to "demonstrate" to external evaluations new mechanisms for personnel management in order to assess

their usefulness and potential for applicability in the Federal service. At the same time, the Project must be workable and acceptable to the participants who have their own internal criteria for judging its success.

Success of the Project is being measured by external evaluators in terms of the impact on recruitment of scientists and engineers for the laboratories; retention of high performers; responsiveness of personnel management processes to the needs of line management; and, the relationship between on-the-job performance and performance-based rewards. These measurements are considered to be key indicators of productivity and efficiency at Navy laboratories.

This paper does not attempt to evaluate the entire Demonstration Project. Rather, this study will focus on specific aspects of the Project which have the potential for affecting line managers in the performance of their jobs. An assessment will be made of the Project from a managerial standpoint to determine how successful it has been in meeting the needs of managers for participation in, and control over, the personnel management functions of position classification and performance evaluation.

A. BACKGROUND

During the administration of President Carter the Civil Service Reform Act was formulated. The Act was passed by the

United States Congress on 13 October 1978, to become effective in January 1979. The Act was intended to improve the productivity, honesty and competency of the Federal service. As a result of the Act, the Civil Service Commission was abolished and replaced by the Office of Personnel Management plus a separate Merit Systems Protection Board.

Another requirement of the Act was the design of new performance appraisal systems for all employees which would appraise performance on the basis of written standards. Employee participation in the development of standards was encouraged, and communication of the standards to affected employees was required. Good performance was to be rewarded, poor performance was to be improved, and continuing poor performance was to be dealt with through reassignment, demotion or removal of poor performers. Many of the features contained in the section on performance appraisal resembled the practice of "Management by Objectives", which will be discussed later in this Chapter.

The Merit Pay System was established by the Act, to directly tie compensation to performance for senior level employees, grades GS-13 through 15, in managerial positions; however, this system did not apply to non-managerial employees, other employees in grades GS-1 through 12, and ungraded workers. The performance appraisal systems for

excluded employees remained essentially the same as they were prior to the Act, where pay increases for satisfactory performance were granted on a periodic basis. As an employee advanced in tenure, pay was automatically adjusted to a higher step at one, two and three year intervals. Unless specific, documented action was taken by the supervisor to withhold such an increase, the raise in pay was automatically granted. Performance evaluation was accomplished only on an annual basis, with each employee's performance being assessed by the immediate supervisor against a scale of general work attributes and personal characteristics which were not directly related to the actual job itself. In many cases, no discussion of this rating ever took place between the supervisor and the employee.

Provisions of the Act allowed Federal agencies to initiate Demonstration Projects to experiment with alternative methods of personnel management which would incorporate the basic premises of the Act. The Act limited the number of such experiments to not more than 10, covering no more than 5,000 employees and lasting up to 5 years in duration. Provisions to waive certain portions of Federal law governing civilian employment in order to facilitate implementation of these projects were included.

At the Naval Weapons Center (NWC) and the Naval Ocean Systems Center (NOSC) the determination was reached that

existing Federal Civil Service regulations did not allow sufficient flexibility to attract and retain the caliber of personnel required at Naval laboratories. Existing regulations strictly limited the entry level salaries that could be offered by recruiters in competition with the private sector. Once hired, an engineer or scientist could progress in pay and status only up to a specified full performance level. To progress beyond that level required the assumption of managerial duties. This presented a serious dilemma for researchers who were technical experts and excelled in their work. They were forced to advance into managerial positions even though they may have lacked the desire to give up actual research work to do so, or remain dead-ended in their jobs. The pay and position classification systems in existence prohibited resolution of the situation; therefore, these systems became primary targets for renovation through the Project.

The joint proposal would incorporate complete revisions to the pay and position classification systems. In order to satisfy the intent of the Act, these new systems would be meshed with a pay for performance concept. The approach to formulate the proposal was to make it a joint effort between the Personnel Department Staffs at NWC and NOSC with assistance provided by the University of Southern California. The proposal was published in the Federal Register on 4

December 1979, public hearings were conducted to solicit comments, and the final proposal [Ref. 2] was submitted to the Office of Personnel Management for approval. OPM approval was ultimately obtained to authorize specific waivers of those portions of Federal law which would interfere with implementation of the Demonstration Project, and the Congress was notified of these waivers.

B. IMPLEMENTATION

On 14 November 1979 Task Teams were established at NWC and NOSC in each of the major areas of focus, the members of which included line managers, employee representatives, and members of the Personnel Department Staff. Each team developed comprehensive plans for implementation in their area of concern, and the total effort was coordinated between the two laboratories. The Demonstration Project was implemented at China Lake and San Diego in July 1980 for an initial population consisting of approximately 2,700 scientific, engineering and senior professional employees at both laboratories. Groups of administrative and technical specialists, technicians, and clerical employees were added to the Project on an incremental basis until the 5,000 employee limit was approached in September 1982. As each new group was added to the Project, they received comprehensive training to introduce them to the new procedures and explain the rationale behind them.

Two designated control laboratories were the Naval Air Development Center, Warminster, Pennsylvania, and the Naval Surface Weapons Laboratory, Dahlgren, Virginia. These control labs would function under existing regulations governing Federal personnel management. Data would be collected periodically at the control laboratories and compared with comparable data from China Lake and San Diego in the three major areas affected by the Demonstration Project. External evaluation was initially performed by the University of Southern California to track progress and report significant findings. An OPM contract for external evaluation was later awarded to the firm of Coopers and Lybrand, and in September 1982 the external evaluation function was taken over by OPM. Internal Evaluation Teams were also established at China Lake and San Diego to monitor the project.

C. SYSTEM MECHANICS

Under the Demonstration Project, managers develop annual performance plans (Exhibit 1) for each employee participating in the Project. These plans contain specific goals and objectives to be met as well as the standards for evaluating employee performance. Employees are encouraged to participate in the development of their own performance plans, and discussions take place between supervisors and employees in order to ensure that an understanding is reached on the content of the plan for each individual employee. A minimum

| NAME | | FOUR | TITLE AND LEVEL | PAC NO |
|------|---|--|-----------------|--------|
| NO | RESPONSIBILITIES Briefly identify tasks and/or functions | EXPECTED RESULTS Identify dimensions to be measured and number of days or weeks | | |
| | | | | |

| | PLANS | | PROGRESS REVIEW | | REVIEWER | PLAN | | PROGRESS REVIEW | |
|------------|----------|------|-----------------|------|----------|----------|------|-----------------|------|
| | INITIALS | DATE | INITIALS | DATE | | INITIALS | DATE | INITIALS | DATE |
| EMPLOYEE | | | | | | | | | |
| SUPERVISOR | | | | | | | | | |

INITIALS: INDICATE THAT A REVIEW OF THE PERFORMANCE AGREEMENT HAS BEEN COMPLETED

| NAME | | FOUR | TITLE AND LEVEL | PAC NO |
|------|--|------------------|-----------------|------------------------------------|
| NO | RESPONSIBILITIES Tasks and/or functions | EXPECTED RESULTS | | INITIALS: employee & Super DATE |
| | | | | |

of two monitoring sessions must be conducted with each employee during the one-year performance evaluation period, and a final written assessment is accomplished at the end of the year by the immediate supervisor. This final rating is reviewed by the second level supervisor, and if the overall performance exceeds the "fully successful" level the rating is subject to further review and approval by a Departmental Performance Review Board (PRB) [Ref. 3]. The PRB has the authority to award pay increases commensurate with the degree by which overall performance exceeded expected results contained in the performance plan. PRB decisions also take into consideration adherence to a payout guideline issued by top management; however, there is no absolute limit on the number and/or amount of pay increases granted. In cases where the final rating is "less than fully successful", corrective action must be initiated by the immediate supervisor.

The involvement of line managers in the pay-setting process has changed under the Project, and managers now participate in making initial pay determinations as well as in determining the amount of annual pay increase that is warranted in relation to the employee's performance of tasks outlined in the performance plan. The former General Schedule pay scale has been replaced by a pay scale for the Demonstration Project, consisting of broad pay bands encompassing several former General Schedule grades into each

pay band (Exhibit 2). These broad bands are divided into increments, which replace the ten steps found in each General Schedule pay grade.

A new position classification system was designed to coincide with the new pay bands included in the Demonstration pay scale. This new system incorporates a dual ladder concept, which permits advancement to a higher level without assumption of supervisory duties. Each classification standard for a particular level includes "menu items" based on material contained in the traditional OPM classification standards for those GS grades encompassed in that level. All menu items are contained in a computerized program designed to prepare position descriptions. This process makes possible the preparation of position descriptions by reference to a handbook containing the various level standards for the major occupational groups: Scientist/Engineer; Administrative Specialist; Technical Specialist; and, Technician. The procedure for preparing position descriptions has changed from what was previously a rigorous writing exercise to a process of "coding" a position description based on selection of relevant menu items from a computerized list of alternatives (Exhibit 3). This coding results in the printing of a personalized description of duties, responsibilities, and qualifications required to perform them, a "Personal Activities and Capabilities"

| OLD SYSTEM | GS 5 | GS 6 | GS 7 | GS 8 | GS 9 | GS 10 | GS 11 | GS 12 | GS 13 | GS 14 | GS 15 | GS 16 | GS 17 | GS 18 | PL ^d |
|--|---|------|------|------|------|---|-------|-------|---|--|--|-------|-------|-------|-----------------|
| NEW SYSTEM | LEVEL I ASSISTANT PROFESSIONAL MEMBER | | | | | LEVEL II ASSOCIATE PROFESSIONAL MEMBER | | | LEVEL III FULL PROFESSIONAL MEMBER | LEVEL IV SENIOR PROFESSIONAL MEMBER | LEVEL V PROFESSIONAL EXCEPTIONAL | | | | |
| NEW PAY RANGE, DOLLARS ^a | 11,243 TO 22,277 ^b | | | | | 17,035 TO 28,855 ^b | | | 24,703 TO 38,186 | 34,713 TO 63,081 ^c | c | | | | |

^a BASED ON OCTOBER 1979 PAY RATES.

^b SUBJECT TO POSSIBLE CHANGE

^c SUBJECT TO STATUTORY LIMITATIONS

^d PUBLIC LAW.

Exhibit 2. Basic Professional Pay Levels and Classification Levels

REQUESTED BY _____
CODE _____

PAC CODING SHEET

PAC NO.: _____ EMPLOYEE'S NAME: _____

SUPERVISORY POSITION

____ YES
____ NO

SERIES: _____ TITLE: _____
LEVEL: _____

FUNCTIONAL CODE

____ RESEARCH
____ DEVELOPMENT
____ TEST

SPECIALTY AREA CODES

____ PRIMARY
____, ____ OTHERS

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|---------|-----|---------|-----|---------|-----|---------|----|-----------|
| A1. | a _____ | A2. | a _____ | B1. | a _____ | C1. | a _____ | H. | Yes _____ |
| | b _____ | | b _____ | | b _____ | | b _____ | | No _____ |
| | c _____ | | c _____ | | c _____ | | c _____ | | |
| | d _____ | | d _____ | | d _____ | | d _____ | | |
| | e _____ | | e _____ | | e _____ | | e _____ | | |
| | f _____ | | f _____ | | f _____ | | f _____ | | |
| | g _____ | | g _____ | | g _____ | | g _____ | | |
| | h _____ | | h _____ | | | | h _____ | | |
| | i _____ | | | | | | | | |
| | j _____ | | | | | | | | |
| | k _____ | | | B2. | a _____ | D1. | a _____ | | |
| | l _____ | | | | b _____ | | b _____ | | |
| | m _____ | | | | c _____ | | c _____ | | |
| | n _____ | | | | d _____ | | d _____ | | |
| | | | | | e _____ | | | | |
| | | | | | f _____ | | | | |
| | | | | | g _____ | | | | |

Exhibit 3. PAC Coding Sheet

statement or PAC. The PAC takes the place of the old position description.

In summary, the level of managerial involvement in the personnel management functions of performance evaluation, pay and position classification have been affected as a result of implementation of the Demonstration Project. This new level of managerial participation is a critical factor in the operation of the new systems, and the primary vehicle for accomplishing the objectives of the Demonstration Project.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

In order to acquire a greater appreciation for the conceptual framework of the Demonstration Project, a review of current literature was conducted. The specific focus of this review concentrated on the topics of performance evaluation and performance-based pay. Only a selected portion of the literature which was examined is cited by reference in this chapter. Other references not specifically cited are contained in the Bibliography, for those readers who wish to explore these topics in greater depth.

A. RELEVANT THEORIES

The task of evaluating performance of professional employees is especially a difficult one. Newman and Hinrichs [Ref. 4] point out that professional employees are "the gatekeepers of important information, the designers of new products and systems, the drivers of productivity." These authors see performance evaluation as an essential means of providing recognition and demonstrating support for effective performance, without which it would be difficult to motivate professionals or to attract and retain them. The process of performance evaluation for professionals depends to a great extent upon the supervisors of these employees. Supervisory feedback is crucial to the success of such a process, for the

work itself is generally difficult to measure and provides only limited feedback. In order to assist supervisors in accomplishing the evaluation task, an appraisal system that is relevant to the performance which is being evaluated and that is workable and acceptable to both supervisors and employees is required.

In 1977, the United States Civil Service Commission published a handbook designed to assist managers in the task of performance evaluation [Ref. 5]. This handbook listed some characteristics of effective performance evaluation programs, which included the following:

- Performance is measured against written standards which are communicated to the employee.
- Instruments for performance appraisal are easy to understand and use.
- Employees are notified, preferably orally and in writing, of their performance ratings.
- The process does not attempt to satisfy all purposes of evaluation in a single annual discussion, but provides other opportunities for supervisors and employees to discuss and plan performance.

The handbook also discusses various methods for developing performance evaluation standards. In a section on "participative methods", the handbook concludes that "employee involvement in work planning, and development of performance standards and appraisals promotes fairer, more objective performance appraisal and results in improved work performance and motivation" [Ref. 5]. For jobs in which work

outputs are difficult to quantify, performance goals may be developed jointly between employees and their supervisors. This approach is characteristic of the "Management by Objectives" (MBO) process [Ref. 6], but MBO does not include methods for establishing individual performance standards. Nevertheless, MBO techniques are useful for obtaining agreement between employees and their supervisors concerning the level of contribution expected toward task accomplishment. Experience with participative approaches suggests that these methods work best when applied to managerial and professional jobs.

Latham and Wexley [Ref. 7] presented the results of a case study concerning motivation of Scientific and Engineering personnel in an international research and development corporation. Their conclusions were in support of participative goal-setting, noting that participation actually caused higher goals to be set than the manager would ordinarily have assigned to employees. More difficult goals corresponded positively to increased effort.

Concerning the linkage between pay and performance, Lawler [Ref. 8] cites four reasons for basing pay on performance:

1. It has potential for motivating effective performance;
2. Achievement-oriented people tend to be attracted to organizations that base rewards on competency;

3. High performers expect to be paid more than low performers;
4. People are more satisfied when they perceive that they are paid in proportion to their efforts.

This author also presents evidence to show that people will make a positive contribution to the success of any new performance-based pay system if they are allowed to participate in the system design. Such participation fosters a climate of trust and openness between management and employees. The organizational climate can be a crucial factor in determining the success or failure of a new pay system. Lawler concludes this discussion by expressing concern about the prospects for success of the Merit Pay System because it forces a radical change from an existing organizational climate which is non-evaluative in nature. Lawler warns that we cannot depend upon a pay system change to facilitate organizational change. If people perceive that they may suffer under the new pay system, they will resist the change.

B. ALTERNATE APPROACHES TO PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

One aspect of the Demonstration Project which can be compared to other existing approaches is the performance evaluation process. While the Naval Weapons Center and the Naval Ocean Systems Center are experimenting with their new performance appraisal procedures, the rest of the Navy has implemented the Merit Pay System in July, 1980. Like the Demonstration Project, the Merit Pay System for performance

evaluation begins the process with the defining of goals, setting of objectives, writing out these objectives, and discussion between the supervisor and the subordinate. An annual appraisal is prepared by the immediate supervisor, and reviewed by the second level supervisor as well as a Merit Pay Review Officer [Ref. 9]. So far the processes are very similar.

The next step in the cycle is the allocation of merit pay funds. A pay pool limit is set by the Secretary of the Navy based on guidance received from OPM. By a simple calculation, the "pot" is divided up between Merit Pay members eligible for a pay increase based on the final evaluation of their performance for that year. The amount of the actual pay raise is not, therefore, strictly a function of an individual's performance but is affected by the amount of available funds. A recent Merit Pay pool was limited to less than 2% of the total Navy managerial payroll. The end result of this process is not pay for performance, but rather resembles rationing of a limited resource.

In 1972, another Demonstration Project was developed by a team of faculty from the Naval Postgraduate School in response to a request from the Office of the Chief of Naval Material [Ref. 10]. This project involved the concept of "peer ratings", and was targeted for employees at the Naval Supply Center (NSC) and the Navy Regional Finance Center

(NRFC), San Diego. This project was implemented at NSC and NRFC by direction from higher headquarters in Washington, and although first-line managers seemed to like it there was resistance and lack of support at the higher management levels at NSC and NRFC which caused the project to terminate after only one year in operation.

Peer ratings seemed to be well accepted by the employees at NSC and NRFC, and although the project itself did not operate long enough to generate detailed performance data it was successful in concept. It should be noted, however, that the levels and types of employees participating in that project were different from those participating in the Merit Pay System. Their jobs were more precise in nature, involving accounting functions, which contributed to greater similarity between groups of jobs and greater understanding among employees of the work being performed by their co-workers. This made the task of judging a co-worker's performance quite a bit simpler due to the homogeneous nature of the work itself.

This project at NSC and NRFC provides an example of the need for management support to contribute to the continuing success of an organizational change. Even though it was apparently successful in concept, this project failed due to the lack of management support.

Looking at the private sector, a type of "Consensus Ranking" is currently being used at the Kaiser Aluminum and Chemical Corporation [Ref. 11]. Called the Objective Judgment Quotient (OJQ), this system leads to a forced numerical ranking for a set of employees. Employees are compared both to one another, as well as to benchmark standards characteristic of their occupational group. The intent of the OJQ is to minimize rater bias in a process which normally tends to be highly subjective. The OJQ is being used on an experimental basis at Kaiser at this time.

Also at Kaiser, a merit pay pool is established subject to budgetary constraints and prescribed target percentages of ratings to be given in each of four performance categories. Employees receiving marginal performance ratings are given a 90-day probationary notice, and could be terminated for failure to improve during probation. Goals, objectives, and specific performance criteria are developed and discussed with employees by their supervisors. Appraisals are accomplished every six months, and the length of the total rating period may vary between nine and fifteen months based on the discretion of the supervisor. This allows the best performers to receive pay raises as often as every nine months, and marginal performers are required to wait longer. Kaiser also offers a comprehensive benefits package for senior managers and executives, which includes bonus and

stock options. The payout for performance-related pay increases alone at Kaiser is currently amounting to 8-9% of the total payroll.

In summary, it becomes clear that there are many operable variations of performance-based evaluation systems in both the public and private sectors. Some key factors that appear to contribute to the success or failure of these approaches are that the organization rewards performance in an equitable manner; that there is a clear relationship between good performance and rewards, and the relationship is clearly understood by employees; that management supports the performance evaluation system and administers it as intended; and, that the amount of the financial incentives offered is large enough so that employees receiving a pay raise recognize that they have in fact been rewarded.

C. DISCUSSION

In consideration of relevant conceptual theories and the needs of Navy laboratories to attract and retain high quality professionals, the proposal for the Demonstration Project was formulated. The performance evaluation system was designed specifically to appraise the performance of professionals, by increasing the requirement for communications and feedback between employees and supervisors and requiring discussion of performance expectations. Guidelines issued by OPM and the CSRA were closely adhered to while making maximum use of the

flexibility permitted by the Act in order to streamline the position classification and pay systems. The intent of involving employees in the development of the new systems that would ultimately affect them under the Project was to foster and enhance an organizational climate that would be conducive to accept the changes.

This approach makes sense in view of the theoretical framework previously presented. It is recognized, however, that procedures alone cannot enforce or ensure that meaningful communication takes place. Likewise, the invention of new position classification and pay systems cannot ensure that the users of these systems will believe that all problems have been solved by the creation of these new systems alone.

The real determining factor that is crucial to the success of any organizational change is the climate of the organization. One facet of that climate is managerial response to planned change. Thus, the examination of managerial attitudes and opinions will give us some useful insights into assessing the level of acceptance of a planned organizational change, a Demonstration Project, and toward predicting the likelihood of success for this change based on the degree to which it meets the needs of managers and facilitates efficient performance of their work.

III. NATURE OF THE PROBLEM

Prior research concerning the Demonstration Project has been conducted by a team at the University of Southern California, by the firm of Coopers and Lybrand, by the Office of Personnel Management (OPM), and by Internal Evaluation Teams at both the Naval Weapons Center and the Naval Ocean Systems Center. Various studies have been published by the evaluators [Refs. 12, 13 and 14]; however, none of these studies have focused specifically on the managerial population affected by the Project. OPM officials have recently determined that the evaluation effort must include data about managerial participation.

While it is possible to break-out some of the existing data in terms of the level and supervisory status of the respondents, the overall orientation of this data is toward the impact of the Project on employees. The existing data does not examine the Project in detail from a managerial perspective. Thus, the need arose to develop a means for collecting managerial data in order to produce an evaluation of the total Demonstration Project.

The research problem is further complicated by the lack of a true experimental control group. Even though two control laboratories were designated by OPM, these labs no longer operate under the same performance evaluation and pay

systems that existed prior to the Civil Service Reform Act (CSRA). Since the Demonstration Project was implemented immediately after leaving the pre-CSRA systems, the only available baseline data is that which was collected about the pre-CSRA systems.

An alternative is to compare managerial baseline data with current data. Since it was not known by the evaluators at the inception of the Project that a specific area of interest would be managerial involvement, very little pre-CSRA data is available in terms of the managerial perspective. A true experiment is, therefore, not possible.

The only remaining alternative is to address the problem through the means of a survey, which eliminates the need for an experimental control group but still affords a way to collect and analyze meaningful data [Ref. 15].

The research question to be addressed by the survey method is to determine the impact of the CSRA Demonstration Project on managers at the Naval Weapons Center. Only the survey results from China Lake will be presented and analyzed in this paper. A total of 3,900 civilians are employed at China Lake, of which 475 are managers participating in the Project. Other managers are employed at China Lake; however, they did not receive the survey because they are not participating in the Project.

Since the specific area of concern to managers prior to the Project was the inflexibility of the total system for personnel management with regard to meeting managerial needs, the survey must explore this concern in detail. Data about managerial time spent on personnel management functions, and the by-products of the classification and performance evaluation processes (namely the position descriptions and performance plans) must be collected for both the pre-CSRA and Demonstration Project Systems. Managerial time is considered to be a valid indicator of efficiency not in terms of increases or decreases in the amounts of time spend on management tasks alone, but also in terms of the quality of the time spent and its overall contribution to productive output.

In view of the fact that very little pre-CSRA data was available from the managerial population specifically pertaining to personnel management functions, it became necessary to attempt to reconstruct the necessary pre-CSRA data based on memory. It is, therefore, recognized that the accuracy of the data about the pre-CSRA system will be affected. Nevertheless, this data is needed in order to make some comparisons between managerial experience under the old and new systems.

IV. THE RESEARCH METHOD

In order to answer the research question to determine the impact of the Demonstration Project on managers at the Naval Weapons Center, an instrument would be needed to collect data from managers. Data would be needed about both the pre-CSRA systems for position classification, pay, and performance evaluation, and the Demonstration Project Systems for the same functions in order to test hypotheses. This data would need to focus on managerial time spent on these functions and the results of their efforts in order to assess and compare the efficiency of the old and new systems.

A. HYPOTHESES

The first hypothesis to be tested is that managers who supervised employees under the old system will find the new system to be an improvement. The reason for this assumption is that one of the major complaints from managers about the pre-CSRA system was that it was not responsive to their needs. The new system was deliberately designed to increase responsiveness by allowing greater participation in, and therefore, control of, system response to better meet the needs of line management.

The second hypothesis is that there will be no difference between the major occupational groups of managers in terms of

preference for the Demonstration Project. This assumption is based on the fact that managers and employees from each major occupational group were instrumental in designing the new systems for the Project with regard to their respective group. This is because separate Task Teams for each of the major occupational groups were established to develop the implementation plans for those systems that would affect them.

A third hypothesis to be tested is that managers will respond that they are able to make other, more productive use of their time under the Project than was possible under the old system. The basis for this assumption is that the streamlining of the classification process would free up more of their time which could be spent on more productive activities.

The fourth hypothesis is that the number of PACs considered by managers as accurate would be greater than the number of position descriptions that were considered accurate under the old system. This response would be attributable to the relative ease of preparing and obtaining classification of PACs versus the problems associated with the classification of position descriptions under the old system.

A fifth hypothesis is that the relative usefulness of PACs will be seen as greater than the usefulness of position descriptions. This ties into the previous rationale for

greater accuracy of PACs as compared to position descriptions, and this higher accuracy should lead to increased relevance of PACs over position descriptions.

The final hypothesis is that the new performance evaluation system under the Demonstration Project will be viewed as more beneficial to managers than the old pre-CSRA system. This assumption is based on the direct relationship in the new system between mission accomplishment and the planning process in which performance expectations are clearly identified in writing and communicated to employees.

B. SURVEY DEVELOPMENT

The first step in conducting this research was to design a survey instrument to collect managerial data. Formulation of a questionnaire began at The Naval Ocean Systems Center, San Diego with a group of personnelists. Inputs to the questionnaire were obtained from operating personnel office staff members based on questions and concerns that were frequently raised by line managers. Some personnelists who have given briefings on the Demonstration Project provided inputs based on questions more frequently asked in these briefings.

The format and organization of the questionnaire was intended to permit collection of data about managerial experiences under the pre-CSRA system, followed by data about the Project, on similar variables. This type of design would facilitate the testing of hypotheses regarding the impact of

changes experienced by managers under the new system. Comparative data would be easier to obtain about the classification process than about performance planning and evaluation, primarily because of the lack of mechanisms for performance planning and monitoring in existence under the pre-CSRA system. For this reason, the major source of data about performance evaluation would be attitudinal rather than quantitative.

The first draft of the questionnaire was forwarded to NWC China Lake to be evaluated by the members of the Internal Evaluation Task Team and personnelists. After providing their inputs, the Task Team members took a pretest of the revised questionnaire.

The approved version of the questionnaire (Appendix A) was distributed at China Lake on 10 March 1983 to the total population of 475 managers. At the time that the deadline for return of questionnaires was reached on 1 April 1983, a total of 265 questionnaires had been returned for a 56% response rate. Nine questionnaires were received after the deadline, making the total response rate 58%; however, these late arrivals were not received in time to be included in this analysis.

C. CONTENT ANALYSIS PROCEDURE

Completed answer sheets for the sample of 265 cases were read by an optical scanner and recorded on magnetic tape.

Two of the cases were not readable by the scanner, which reduced the sample size to 263 cases. A program was developed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) to analyze the data. The Frequencies procedure was used to generate tables for each of the survey questions. Contingency tables were then produced for the key variables to be analyzed in order to test hypotheses, using the Crosstabs procedure. Each variable is identified in the tables found in Appendix B, and all variables are listed in the indices contained at the end of that Appendix.

Following the SPSS analysis, a cost-effectiveness model was developed. The model utilized the criterion of maximum effectiveness/cost ratio. The following equations are included in the model:

$$\text{Cost} = \text{Supervisory Manhours} \times \text{Supervisory Salary}$$

$$\text{Effectiveness} = f(\text{variable list})$$

The variables selected for use in the effectiveness equation were chosen on the basis of their perceived contribution to the overall accomplishment of a manager's job. The model was used to compare estimated costs and effects for the pre-CSRA systems with the costs and effects under the Project. Tables 3-1 and 3-2 present the cost and effectiveness data, respectively.

TABLE 3-1 COST DATA
1a costpds ccst of preparing position descriptions

| cost | FREQ | PCT | cost | FREQ | PCT | cost | FREQ | PCT |
|-------|------|-----|---------|------|-----|---------|------|-----|
| \$ 0. | 46 | 17 | \$ 105. | 3 | 1 | \$ 210. | 2 | 1 |
| 11. | 5 | 2 | 109. | 4 | 2 | 214. | 2 | 1 |
| 21. | 5 | 2 | 111. | 2 | 1 | 218. | 1 | 0 |
| 25. | 5 | 2 | 113. | 2 | 1 | 221. | 3 | 0 |
| 32. | 7 | 3 | 126. | 1 | 0 | 225. | 1 | 0 |
| 36. | 3 | 1 | 128. | 2 | 1 | 239. | 1 | 0 |
| 42. | 6 | 2 | 130. | 2 | 1 | 242. | 3 | 1 |
| 46. | 2 | 1 | 134. | 1 | 0 | 244. | 3 | 1 |
| 50. | 3 | 1 | 137. | 5 | 2 | 252. | 4 | 2 |
| 53. | 6 | 3 | 139. | 1 | 0 | 256. | 1 | 0 |
| 57. | 1 | 0 | 141. | 1 | 0 | 263. | 2 | 1 |
| 61. | 2 | 1 | 145. | 2 | 1 | 271. | 1 | 0 |
| 67. | 4 | 2 | 155. | 1 | 0 | 277. | 2 | 1 |
| 71. | 3 | 1 | 158. | 5 | 2 | 294. | 2 | 1 |
| 76. | 1 | 0 | 168. | 8 | 3 | 305. | 1 | 0 |
| 78. | 4 | 2 | 172. | 3 | 1 | 326. | 4 | 2 |
| 82. | 2 | 1 | 181. | 1 | 0 | 330. | 1 | 0 |
| 84. | 6 | 2 | 185. | 1 | 0 | 336. | 1 | 0 |
| 86. | 6 | 2 | 187. | 2 | 1 | 357. | 3 | 1 |
| 88. | 3 | 1 | 189. | 2 | 1 | 361. | 1 | 0 |
| 95. | 1 | 0 | 193. | 2 | 1 | 389. | 1 | 0 |
| 97. | 3 | 1 | 197. | 1 | 0 | 420. | 1 | 0 |
| 99. | 1 | 0 | 200. | 1 | 0 | | | |
| 101. | 4 | 2 | 204. | 1 | 0 | | | |
| 103. | 2 | 1 | 208. | 1 | 0 | | | |

MEAN 105.380

1b costpacs cost of preparing pacs

| cost | FREQ | PCT | cost | FREQ | PCT | cost | FREQ | PCT |
|-------|------|-----|--------|------|-----|---------|------|-----|
| \$ 0. | 2 | 1 | \$ 34. | 5 | 2 | \$ 113. | 1 | 0 |
| 3. | 6 | 2 | 39. | 1 | 0 | 129. | 1 | 0 |
| 5. | 1 | 0 | 42. | 1 | 0 | 163. | 1 | 0 |
| 8. | 5 | 1 | 45. | 3 | 1 | 181. | 1 | 0 |
| 11. | 5 | 2 | 53. | 1 | 0 | 197. | 1 | 0 |
| 13. | 5 | 2 | 63. | 2 | 1 | 200. | 1 | 0 |
| 16. | 4 | 1 | 66. | 1 | 0 | 202. | 1 | 0 |
| 18. | 9 | 3 | 68. | 1 | 0 | 210. | 1 | 0 |
| 21. | 1 | 0 | 74. | 2 | 1 | 263. | 1 | 0 |
| 24. | 6 | 2 | 76. | 1 | 0 | 341. | 1 | 0 |
| 26. | 3 | 1 | 95. | 9 | 4 | | | |
| 32. | 36 | 14 | 105. | 4 | 2 | | | |

MEAN, 31.172

TABLE 3-2 EFFECTIVENESS DATA (GENERATED BY MAUM)

| evaluation items | position description (pd) | personal activities and capabilities statement (pac) |
|--|------------------------------|---|
| usefulness | m | m |
| accuracy | m | h |
| manhours: level a, 1 & 2 (gs-5 11) | 1 | 1 |
| dt ds da-3 (gs-12 tech, adm, spec) | h | 1 |
| dp-3 (gs-12 & gs-13) | h | 1 |
| dp-4 (gs-14 & gs-15) | h | 1 |

key: 1 = low

m = medium

h = high

V. SURVEY RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Appendix B contains the tables produced by computer output as a result of an analysis of the survey data, using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). Tables which give the frequency distribution on responses to each question contained in the questionnaire are presented, preceded by seven contingency tables generated to test hypotheses. Some highlights of the results are presented in this chapter.

Tables numbered 1 through 4 present demographic data about the respondents. Managers classified as scientists and engineers comprised 68% of the respondents; administrative specialists accounted for 19% of the sample; technical specialists comprised 5% of the respondents; and, 9% were technicians. The mean salary for all Project supervisory personnel was \$43,682 per annum. Approximately 69% of the respondents were first line supervisors. Eighty percent of these managers were in supervisory positions at the time the Demonstration Project was implemented for their occupational group. The other 20% became supervisors under the new system, which in most cases indicates the absence of supervisory experience under the old system. Ninety-three percent of all Project supervisors have over ten years of

Federal service, and 54% have over twenty years. The demographic data contained in these tables was supplemented by information from the personnel database.

Table 5 indicates that 61% of the supervisors responded that they were the usual author of General Schedule position descriptions for their subordinates. Forty-eight percent reported that they wrote one to three position descriptions per year under the old system, while 22% wrote between four and ten per year as noted in Table 22. Table 24 illustrates that 32% of the managers estimated that up to 10% of all position descriptions in their organization were inaccurate, and 22% recalled the percentage of inaccurate descriptions to be between 11 and 25%. The major reason noted for not updating more of these inaccurate descriptions was that accuracy was not considered important under the old system by 46% of the supervisors (Table 26). Seventy percent recalled that they used each position description not more than twice per year in Table 27. The major uses noted in Tables 28 through 31 in order of importance were for performance appraisal, required reviews, recruitment, and promotion.

Table 6 illustrates that 58% of the managers responding indicated that they were the usual author of Personal Activities and Capability Statements (PACs) written for their employees. Tables 35 through 38 show that only a very small percentage of PACs took more than three hours to prepare,

while the majority took less than one hour each. Ninety-three percent of the respondents felt that 10% or less of all PACs were inaccurate (Table 50). The major uses for PACs illustrated in Tables 52 through 55 in order of importance were performance appraisal, required reviews, promotion, instructing employees, and recruitment.

Ninety-one percent of all respondents in Table 58 replied that the position classification process is simplified under the Demonstration Project. Ninety-one percent also felt that the classification process takes less time under the Project (Table 59). Sixty-five percent responded that classification is better understood under the Project in Table 66. Seventy-eight percent of the managers responded that they are able to make other more productive uses of their time now (Table 67).

Tables 72 and 73 show that a majority of managers spend a decreased amount of time preparing PACs to be classified, and negotiating about their classification with Personnel specialists. Sixty-eight percent felt that they are spending more time now on performance planning (Table 74). Performance reviews and monitoring are on the increase according to 77% in Table 76. Pay decisions, aware recommendations and Performance Review Boards use up more time now according to 64% of the respondents in Table 77. The majority of other supervisory functions relating to personnel management are reported as unchanged by the Project.

Seventy-six percent of the managers responding in Table 79 felt that the overall net change of the Demonstration Project is an improvement over the old system. The contribution of performance planning to mission accomplishment is reported as greater under the Project by 62% of the respondents in Table 80. Setting of objectives, monitoring of performance, and annual performance ratings are viewed as beneficial by over 85% of the respondents in Tables 81, 82 and 83. Fifty-nine percent view the linkage between performance evaluation and pay as beneficial (Table 85). Communication of performance expectations is up for 62% in Table 88, and 66% feel that employees know more about what's expected of them now in Table 89. Over 70% responded that performance plans help to identify employee training needs, and to deal with performance problems in Tables 96 and 97.

Table 99 reports that 77% of the managers responded that the Demonstration Project is seen as beneficial to their overall supervisory performance. Table 100 concludes the questionnaire results with 78% of the respondents stating their preference for the Project.

In relation to the specific hypotheses listed in Chapter IV, the contingency tables located at the front of Appendix B confirm hypotheses one, three, four, and six. These null hypotheses are as follows:

- H₁: Those respondents who were supervisors at the time of entry into the Project found the new system to be an improvement.
- H₃: Managers feel that they are making other, more productive use of their time now.
- H₄: PACs are more accurate than position descriptions were under the old system.
- H₆: The Project performance evaluation process makes a greater contribution to mission accomplishment than the old system.

Hypotheses two and five were disproved by the analysis.

The following alternate hypotheses were proven:

- H_{2A}: There is a difference between the level of satisfaction with the Demonstration Project for the major occupational groups.
- H_{5A}: PACs are not considered to be more useful than position descriptions.

Scientists/Engineers and Administrative Specialists reported a higher satisfaction rate with the Project than did Technical Specialists and Technicians. It should be noted that there is a high correlation between the two groups comprising a majority of the Project participants and the higher satisfaction rate.

Regarding the relative usefulness of PACs, the majority of the respondents indicated no improvement over the usefulness of position descriptions under the old system. This tends to negate the importance of increased accuracy of PACs.

The overall results of the managerial survey have been in favor of the Demonstration Project. While some improvements

were reported in the total position classification process, the end result of that process (PAC) was not found to be any more useful than its predecessor; however, the performance planning process was viewed as very beneficial in several key areas of importance to managers. Mission accomplishment is enhanced, communications are increased, and the plans are a useful tool for identifying training needs and handling employee performance problems.

Several constructive suggestions were provided by the respondents as an addendum to the survey data. Some managers recommended that the decision to award a pay raise should be made without the constraint of a pay guideline. Others question the value of awarding pay raises solely in recognition of performance. A need arises for some mechanism to protect the equity of salaries for current employees against the higher entry level salaries that are offered to new hires. Some suggestions came out in favor of avoiding further attempts to regulate the pay system with the addition of midpoint constraints. These issues warrant further attention by the Task Teams, Steering Committee, and internal evaluators.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

This paper has presented a broad overview of the conceptual framework for a Demonstration Project. The current literature was researched and selected relevant theories were presented. Examples of other approaches to the practice of performance evaluation were presented and described. Through the development, administration, and analysis of survey data specific hypotheses were tested and attitudinal information was collected about the impact of this Project on managers at the Naval Weapons Center.

In this concluding chapter, the results of this study are reviewed so that it may serve as an executive summary for readers interested in a recapitulation of the highlights of the study. For a complete breakdown of the survey data, Appendix B should be examined.

Much of the current literature presents evidence in support of a participative approach to the design, development and administration of performance evaluation and pay systems. Communication is stressed as an important ingredient to the success of such an approach. Equity is also considered to be a key variable to the successful operation of performance-based pay systems. A high level of trust is needed between employees and management in order for

performance-based rewards and significant changes in pay administration to be accepted. A clear relationship between performance standards and behavior that is rewarded is essential to that acceptance. The use of a participative approach, therefore, is not in itself a guarantee of success.

The survey results from China Lake show that, overall, managers prefer the Demonstration Project to the pre-CSRA approach to personnel management; however, there are some specific areas of concern that evidence the need for further attention. Acceptance of the Project is not equal among the major occupational groups. Scientist/Engineers and Administrative Specialists are more satisfied with the Project than are Technical Specialists and Technicians. This may be indicative of a need to reexamine the specific concerns of those groups which are less satisfied.

PACs are more accurate than position descriptions but not considered to be any more useful. There appears to be very little recognition of any relationship between a PAC and a performance plan, which contains specific expectations about how the job is to be done. Also, PACs are not used any more frequently than position descriptions, and the major reasons for their use are the same as for PDs with the exception of the addition of the use of PACs for instructing employees about the work. Line managers are still the usual authors of PACs, in the majority of cases, but they now spend less time

preparing PACs and getting them classified than under the pre-CSRA system.

While a reduction of managerial time spent on position classification is evident, the net change in time spent on personnel management functions is not significant due to an increase in time spent on performance planning, monitoring and review, pay and award decisions. Managers consider the increased amount of time spent on setting objectives, monitoring performance, and preparing annual performance ratings to be beneficial in accomplishing their supervisory responsibilities. Performance plans are seen as useful in identifying employee training needs and performance problems. We may conclude then that a majority of managers consider that their time is better spent under the Project in terms of productive outputs.

Finally, the cost-effectiveness model illustrates comparisons of data about the investments for managers in terms of manhours and salary, and the resulting levels of effectiveness in terms of their performance as supervisors both before and after the implementation of the Project. Again, it must be noted that the only obtainable data in terms of manhours and effectiveness pertains to the position classification function. This data is not entirely reliable based on the fact that it was necessary for respondents to recall from memory their experiences under the old system.

Nevertheless, it is clear that managers do not find the position classification process to be a positive contributor to their supervisory performance. Rather, they view it as a task that must be done in order to recruit and promote employees. Time saved in the position classification process is primarily useful to managers because they are now able to devote that time to more productive activities.

One final reference that I would like to cite to put the results of this study into perspective comes from a very recent publication based on studies of some of the more successful firms in the United States. Peters and Waterman point out that when an organization fails, that failure is seldom attributed to a lack of concern for people on the part of management [Ref. 16]. The most successful companies, however, look to people to increase productivity rather than to financial controls or technology. These firms are characterized by a tough approach to management, but that approach is enforced by shared expectations and peer pressure rather than by elaborate control systems. No one particular approach to management can guarantee success indefinitely. Overreliance on systems and mechanisms alone cannot enhance true productivity.

My reason for ending this study with Peter's and Waterman's thoughts about productivity is to reinforce the importance of paying attention to people and their needs for

recognition. It would be very risky to expect an elaborate system such as this Demonstration Project to successfully meet those needs. Such a system must be kept flexible in order to be responsive to the needs of people, and to managers in particular, for it cannot ever become a substitute for good judgment about how to supervise people.



SAMPLE QUESTIONNAIRE
DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
NAVAL WEAPONS CENTER
CHINA LAKE, CALIFORNIA 93555

IN REPLY REFER TO:
10 Mar 1983

MEMORANDUM

From: Technical Director
To: Demonstration Project Supervisors and Managers
Subj: Evaluation of Demonstration Project

Encl: (1) Questionnaire regarding personnel functions performed by
supervisors and instruction and answer sheets

1. A critical portion of the evaluation of the Demonstration Project will be an assessment of its impact on supervisors' involvement in personnel management functions. As a Demonstration Project Supervisor or Manager, you are being asked to help in this assessment effort by completing the enclosed questionnaire. Some of the questions ask that you estimate times spent on personnel functions prior to the beginning of the Demonstration Project in July 1980. Although we realize it is very difficult to reconstruct activities that long ago, we would appreciate your help in making estimates.
2. Since this questionnaire (enclosure (1)) is being used at both NOSC and NWC, some questions will be specific to one or the other Center. This will be indicated on the questions. Please disregard those questions labeled "NOSC only."
3. The completed questionnaires will be processed by automated equipment which will summarize the answers in statistical form. Your individual answers will remain strictly confidential, and they will be combined with those of the other respondents. An optical scanning answer sheet and instructions are enclosed. Please return the answer sheet, along with any written comments, to Code 0902 at your earliest convenience but not later than 1 April 1983.
4. Thank you for your cooperation in this effort. If you would like a summary of the results of this questionnaire, please indicate below.

Instruction Sheet for Answers to Questionnaire

1. The answer sheet, General Purpose-NCS-Answer Sheet, is the enclosed green-colored sheet (one page with two sides). It is a standard, low-cost scoring sheet compatible with optical scanning equipment which will be used for tallying the responses.
2. Ignore the left-hand portion of side 1 which starts with "name". This section will not be used and should not have any marks placed on it.
3. Start by reading side 2 of the answer sheet which provides marking directions. Please use a No.2 pencil for scoring.
4. Begin marking your choices from the questionnaire on side 1 of the answer sheet. Start with question 1. For example, if your answer is "4" on question 1, mark column "4" on the answer sheet for question 1.
5. If you want to add any written comments, enclose them on a separate sheet of paper. Please do not write comments on the green answer sheet as they will interfere with the optical scan tally.
6. Please return the answer sheet (do not fold it) and any separate written comments in a guard mail envelope to Code 0902. Please do not return the questionnaire.
7. If you have any questions, contact Bob Glen (Code 0902) at extension 3196 or 2434. Thanks for your cooperation and assistance.

DEMO PROJECT SUPERVISORS' QUESTIONNAIRE.

This is a one-time data gathering effort. Please consider carefully, and answer as to how the systems were or are actually working, not how they should have been or should be working. See the enclosed instruction sheet for answering this questionnaire.

The use of the optical scan answer sheet has resulted in a rather lengthy questionnaire; however, pre-testing indicates that 20 minutes should be sufficient time for completing the questionnaire. Your responses are critical for valid overall evaluation results.

1. What is your current classification?
 1. Scientist/Engineer(1)
 2. Administrative(2)
 3. Specialist(3)
 4. Technician(4)
2. What is your organizational level?
 1. Branch or Unit Head(1)
 2. Division Head or Assoc. Div. Hd.(2)
 3. Department Head or Assoc. Dept. Hd.(3)
 4. Director, Major Staff Office Head or Above .(4)
 5. Head, Program Office(5)
3. Were you a supervisor/manager in July 1980 when NOSC/NWC entered into the Demonstration Project?
 1. Yes(1)
 2. No(2)
4. If yes, were you
 1. At the same organizational level(1)
 2. At a lower organizational level(2)

Classification experience prior to Demonstration Project:

5. In the organization which you supervised prior to July 1980, were GS position descriptions usually drafted or written by:
 1. Yourself(1)
 2. A lower level supervisor(2)
 3. A staff assistant(3)
 4. The employee(4)

In the organization which you supervised prior to July 1980, about how many hours did you personally spend in drafting, reviewing, discussing final preparation of or negotiating over a typical position description in each of the following categories?

6. GS-14/15

1. Less than 4 hours(1)
2. 4-8 hours(2)
3. 9-16 hours(3)
4. More than 16 hours(4)
5. None done at this level(5)

7. GS-13

1. Less than 4 hours(1)
2. 4-8 hours(2)
3. 9-16 hours(3)
4. More than 16 hours(4)
5. None done at this level(5)

8. GS-12 Scientist, Engineer

1. Less than 4 hours(1)
2. 4-8 hours(2)
3. 9-16 hours(3)
4. More than 16 hours(4)
5. None at this level(5)

9. GS-12 Technician, Administrative, Specialist

1. Less than 4 hours(1)
2. 4-8 hours(2)
3. 9-16 hours(3)
4. More than 16 hours(4)
5. None at this level(5)

10. GS-5/11 Engineer, Scientist, Technician, Administrative

1. Less than 4 hours(1)
2. 4-8 hours(2)
3. 9-16 hours(3)
4. More than 16 hours(4)
5. None at this level(5)

11. Clerical/Secretarial/Assistant (NOSC only)

1. Less than 4 hours(1)
2. 4-8 hours(2)
3. 9-16 hours(3)
4. More than 16 hours(4)
5. None at this level(5)

After final preparation, about how many working days did it usually take for final approval/classification of each of the following:

12. GS-14/15

1. Less than 4 days (1)
2. 4-8 days (2)
3. 9-16 days (3)
4. 17-30 days (4)
5. More than 30 days (5)
6. None at this level (6)

13. GS-13

1. Less than 4 days (1)
2. 4-8 days (2)
3. 9-16 days (3)
4. 17-30 days (4)
5. More than 30 days (5)
6. None at this level (6)

14. GS-12 Scientist, Engineer

1. Less than 4 days (1)
2. 4-8 days (2)
3. 9-16 days (3)
4. 17-30 days (4)
5. More than 30 days (5)
6. None at this level (6)

15. GS-12 Technician, Administrative, Specialist

1. Less than 4 days (1)
2. 4-8 days (2)
3. 9-16 days (3)
4. 17-30 days (4)
5. More than 30 days (5)
6. None at this level (6)

16. GS-5/11 Engineer, Scientist, Technician, Administrative

1. Less than 4 days (1)
2. 4-8 days (2)
3. 9-16 days (3)
4. 17-30 days (4)
5. More than 30 days (5)
6. None at this level (6)

17. Clerical/Secretarial/Assistant (NOSC only)

1. Less than 4 days (1)
2. 4-8 days (2)
3. 9-16 days (3)
4. 17-30 days (4)
5. More than 30 days (5)
6. None at this level (6)

During a one year period, about how many position descriptions of each of the following types were prepared in the organization which you supervised? (Consider those needed for recruitment, reassignment, update for currency, promotion, etc.)

18. GS-14/15

- 1. None (1)
- 2. 1-3 (2)
- 3. 4-10 (3)
- 4. 11-20 (4)
- 5. 21-40 (5)
- 6. Over 40 (6)

19. GS-13

- 1. None (1)
- 2. 1-3 (2)
- 3. 4-10 (3)
- 4. 11-20 (4)
- 5. 21-40 (5)
- 6. Over 40 (6)

20. GS-12 Scientist, Engineer

- 1. None (1)
- 2. 1-3 (2)
- 3. 4-10 (3)
- 4. 11-20 (4)
- 5. 21-40 (5)
- 6. Over 40 (6)

21. GS-12 Technician, Administrative, Specialist

- 1. None (1)
- 2. 1-3 (2)
- 3. 4-10 (3)
- 4. 11-20 (4)
- 5. 21-40 (5)
- 6. Over 40 (6)

22. GS-5/11 Engineer, Scientist, Technician, Administrative

- 1. None (1)
- 2. 1-3 (2)
- 3. 4-10 (3)
- 4. 11-20 (4)
- 5. 21-40 (5)
- 6. Over 40 (6)

23. Clerical/Secretarial/Assistant (NOSC only)

- 1. None (1)
- 2. 1-3 (2)
- 3. 4-10 (3)
- 4. 11-20 (4)
- 5. 21-40 (5)
- 6. Over 40 (6)

24. How many position descriptions in your organization were typically out of date or inaccurate?

1. None(1)
2. 1-10%(2)
3. 11-25%(3)
4. 26-50%(4)
5. 51-99%(5)
6. All(6)

25. Were any inaccuracies primarily:

1. Major(1)
2. Minor(2)

26. What was the major reason for not updating position descriptions:

1. It took too much time.(1)
2. There was no payoff.(2)
3. Didn't want to jeopardize employee's GS rating(3)
4. Accuracy of P.D.'s wasn't important enough to spend the time and effort updating them. . .(4)
5. Not applicable(5)

27. On the average about how many times per year did you actually use or refer to an established position description in your organization?

1. Never(1)
2. 1-2 times each(2)
3. 3-5 times each(3)
4. More than 5 times each(4)

28. - 31. What were the major purposes for referring to a PD?

Use answer sheet items 28-31 to indicate up to four purposes

1. Performance appraisal(1)
2. Instructing/Guiding employees(2)
3. Required reviews (accuracy, currency, position management report, maintenance review, etc.)(3)
4. Position management decisions(4)
5. Manpower planning(5)
6. Recruitment (preparing and/or requesting certificate)(6)
7. Refer to when making assignments(7)
8. Promotion(8)
9. Reassignment(9)
10. Guideline for writing similar PDs(10)

32. In general, how useful were the position descriptions to you?

1. Very useful.(1)
2. Moderately useful.(2)
3. Not useful(3)
4. Irrelevant(4)
5. Interfered with my job accomplishment . . .(5)

33. In general, how well informed or involved in position description preparation and the classification process were your non-supervisory employees?

1. Little or no involvement/knowledge(1)
2. Understood what a P.D. is and its primary uses(2)
3. Thoroughly understood the process.(3)

Demonstration Project Classification Experience

34. In the organization you now supervise, are Level/Specialty Designators (NOSC) or PACs (NWC) usually drafted or written by:

1. Yourself(1)
2. A lower level supervisor(2)
3. A staff assistant(3)
4. The employee(4)

About how many hours do you now spend in preparing, discussing negotiating over a typical Level/Specialty Designator(NOSC) or PAC (NWC) in each of the following categories?

35. DP-IV

1. Less than 1 hour(1)
2. 1-3 hours(2)
3. 4-8 hours(3)
4. 9-16 hours(4)
5. Over 16 hours(5)
6. None at this level(6)

36. DP-III

1. Less than 1 hour(1)
2. 1-3 hours(2)
3. 4-8 hours(3)
4. 9-16 hours(4)
5. Over 16 hours(5)
6. None at this level(6)

37. DT, DS, DA, III
1. Less than 1 hour(1)
 2. 1-3 hours(2)
 3. 4-8 hours(3)
 4. 9-16 hours(4)
 5. Over 16 hours(5)
 6. None at this level(6)
38. DP, DT, DS, DA Levels A, I and II
1. Less than 1 hour(1)
 2. 1-3 hours(2)
 3. 4-8 hours(3)
 4. 9-16 hours(4)
 5. Over 16 hours(5)
 6. None at this level(6)
39. Clerical/Secretarial/Assistant (NOSC only)
1. Less than 1 hour(1)
 2. 1-3 hours(2)
 3. 4-8 hours(3)
 4. 9-16 hours(4)
 5. Over 16 hours(5)
 6. None at this level(6)

After final preparation, about how many working days does it usually take for final approval/classification of each of the following?

40. DP-IV

1. 1-3 days(1)
2. 4-8 days(2)
3. 9-16 days(3)
4. 16-30 days(4)
5. Over 30 days(5)
6. None at this level(6)

41. DP-III

1. 1-3 days(1)
2. 4-8 days(2)
3. 9-16 days(3)
4. 16-30 days(4)
5. Over 30 days(5)
6. None at this level(6)

42. DT, DS, DA III

1. 1-3 days(1)
2. 4-8 days(2)
3. 9-16 days(3)
4. 16-30 days(4)
5. Over 30 days(5)
6. None at this level(6)

43. DP, DT, DS, DA Levels A, I & II

1. 1-3 days(1)
2. 4-8 days(2)
3. 9-16 days(3)
4. 16-30 days(4)
5. Over 30 days(5)
6. None at this level(6)

44. Clerical/Secretarial/Assistant (NOSC only)

1. 1-3 days(1)
2. 4-8 days(2)
3. 9-16 days(3)
4. 16-30 days(4)
5. Over 30 days(5)
6. None at this level(6)

Under the Demo, during a one year period, about how many PACs (NWC) or Level/Specialty Designators (NOSC) of each of the following types are prepared in your organization? (Consider those needed for recruitment, reassignment, update for currency, promotion, etc. Do not count those prepared for entering employees into the Demonstration Project initially.)

45. DP IV

1. None (1)
2. 1-3 (2)
3. 4-10 (3)
4. 11-20 (4)
5. 21-40 (5)
6. Over 40 (6)

46. DP III

1. None (1)
2. 1-3 (2)
3. 4-10 (3)
4. 11-20 (4)
5. 21-40 (5)
6. Over 40 (6)

47. DT, DS, DA III

1. None (1)
2. 1-3 (2)
3. 4-10 (3)
4. 11-20 (4)
5. 21-40 (5)
6. Over 40 (6)

48. DP, DT, DS, DA Levels A, I & II

1. None (1)
2. 1-3 (2)
3. 4-10 (3)
4. 11-20 (4)
5. 21-40 (5)
6. Over 40 (6)

49. Clerical/Secretarial/Assistant (NOSC only)

1. None (1)
2. 1-3 (2)
3. 4-10 (3)
4. 11-20 (4)
5. 21-40 (5)
6. Over 40 (6)

50. About how many Level/Specialty Designators (NOSC) PACs (NWC) are inaccurate or out of date in your organization?
1. None(1)
 2. 1-10%(2)
 3. 11-25%(3)
 4. 26-50%(4)
 5. 51-99%(5)
 6. All(6)
51. Do you use L/SD's (NOSC), PACs (NWC)?
1. Less often than P.D.'s(1)
 2. About the same as P.D.'s(2)
 3. More often than P.D.'s(3)
- 52.- 55. For what purposes? (use answer sheet lines 51-54 to indicate up to 4 major purposes)
1. Performance appraisal(1)
 2. Instructing/guiding employees(2)
 3. Required reviews (accuracy, currency, position, management report, maintenance review, etc.).(3)
 4. Position management decisions(4)
 5. Manpower planning(5)
 6. Recruitment (preparing and/or requesting certificate(6)
 7. Refer to when making assignments(7)
 8. Promotion(8)
 9. Reassignment(9)
 10. Guideline for writing similar PDs(10)
56. In general, how useful are PACs (NWC), L/SD's (NOSC) to you?
1. Very useful(1)
 2. Moderately useful.(2)
 3. Not useful(3)
 4. Irrelevant(4)
 5. Interfere with my job accomplishment(5)
57. In general, how well informed or involved in L/SD (NOSC), PACs (NWC) preparation and the classification process are your nonsupervisory employees now?
1. Little or no involvement/knowledge(1)
 2. Understand what a L/SD (NOSC), PACs (NWC) is and its primary uses(2)
 3. Thoroughly understand the process.(3)

Please provide your frank opinions below in light of your Demonstration Project experience

| | True | Partially True | Not True | Don't Know |
|--|------|-------------------|-------------|---------------|
| 58. Classification is simpler & more understandable than before. | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| 59. Classification takes significantly less time than before. | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| 60. Classification paper work is significantly decreased in the Demo environment. | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| 61. Demo classification levels are logical and reflect real world differences in difficulty. | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| 62. Classification authority is responsibly exercised at this Center. | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| 63. Conflicts/classification pressures are significantly reduced. | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| 64. Conflicts/classification pressures are eliminated. | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| 65. Position management is more important than before. | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| 66. Supervisors and employees understand Demo classification better than the GS classification system. | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| 67. Other more productive use is made of my time and knowledge than under the old classification system. | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| 68. Relations between supervisors, employees, and personnel specialists are better than before. | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |

| | TRUE | PARTIALLY TRUE | NOT TRUE | DON'T KNOW |
|---|------|-------------------|-------------|---------------|
| 69. My personnel advisors now provide more productive assistance than before. | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |

In the personnel management areas listed below indicate whether you have experienced increases/decreases in work under the Demo:

| | INCREASED | ABOUT SAME | DECREASED | DON'T KNOW |
|---|-----------|---------------|-----------|---------------|
| 70. Long range planning, manpower needs determination, position management. | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| 71. Recruiting, interviewing, selecting employees. | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| 72. Classification: preparing, reviewing PACs or L/SD's instead of PDs. | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| 73. Classification: negotiation with personnel advisors. | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| 74. Planning work with/for my employees (including development of performance plans) | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| 75. Developing, coaching, on-the-job training of my employess. | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| 76. Reviewing performance, monitoring sessions, appraising performance, providing feedback to employees. | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| 77. Compensation (e.g., pay out decisions, salary management, other monetary awards, performance review board meetings, etc.) | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |

INCREASED

ABOUT
SAME

DECREASED

DON'T
KNOW

8. Dealing with employee management relations matters (retirements, removals, discipline, grievances, appeals, etc.) (1) (2) (3) (4)

9. Do you view the net change as an improvement:

1. Yes (1)
2. No (2)

10. The GS/WG performance appraisal system provided for "O" outstanding, "S" satisfactory, and "U" unsatisfactory ratings. No performance planning was required. In comparison, do you feel the Demo Project performance appraisal system contributes to your mission accomplishment?

1. More than the GS/WG system (1)
2. About the same (2)
3. Less than the GS/WG system (3)

Please describe the parts of the Demo performance appraisal system as follows:

| | Highly Beneficial | Beneficial | Not Important or Neither | Detrimental | Very Detrimental |
|---|-------------------|------------|--------------------------|-------------|------------------|
| 81. Setting objectives/ performance planning. | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) |
| 82. Monitoring/review(s) | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) |
| 83. Year-end performance appraisal | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) |
| 84. Rating definitions | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) |
| 85. Linkage with pay | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) |
| 86. Management review process | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) |

| | MORE | SAME | LESS |
|--|------|------|------|
| 87. In general, how much do you (or your subordinate supervisors) know about the work your employees are actually doing compared with what you knew under the GS system? | (1) | (2) | (3) |

88. How much communication about work expectations between the employees and supervisors in your organization is there now compared with before the Demo Project? (1) (2) (3)

89. In general, how much do you feel employees know about what is expected of them now as compared to before the Demo Project? (1) (2) (3)

90. (NOSC) The paperwork required (Form NOSC 12430/1), Performance Planning Appraisal is:
 1. Insufficient for my need (1)
 2. About right (2)
 3. Excessive (3)

91. (MVC) The paperwork required (NAVWPNCEN 12430/8) Performance Plan-Demonstration Project and (NAVWPNCEN 12430/9) Performance Assessment-Demonstration Project is:
 1. Insufficient for my need (1)
 2. About right (2)
 3. Excessive (3)

Does the time you spend on performance planning and appraisal under the Demonstration Project contribute to your accomplishment of the following tasks:

| | Highly Beneficial | Beneficial | Not Important or Neither | Detrimen- tal | Very Detrimen- tal |
|---|----------------------|------------|-----------------------------------|------------------|--------------------------|
| 92. Long range planning. | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) |
| 93. Determining manpower requirements. | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) |
| 94. Work scheduling. | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) |
| 95. Reporting to higher level management/sponsors | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) |
| 96. Identifying training needs for employees. | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) |
| 97. Dealing with employee problems. | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) |

98. Predicting financial requirements (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
99. Overall performance of my job as a supervisor/manager. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
100. Overall, would you rather work in the Demo environment than in the pre-July 1980 personnel management system?
1. Yes(1)
 2. No(2)

APPENDIX B
COMPUTER DATA TABLES

CROSS TABULATION OF
ENTRSUPV SUPERVISOR AT DEMO ENTRY #3 BY
DEMOIMP IS DEMO NET CHANGE AN IMPROVEMENT #79

| | DEMOIMP | | ROW TOTAL |
|-----------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|--------------|
| | YES | NO | |
| ENTRSUPV | 1. | 2. | |
| YES | 173 83.6 71.2 | 34 16.4 79.1 14.0 | 207 85.2 |
| NO | 27 75.0 13.5 11.1 | 9 25.0 20.9 3.7 | 36 14.8 |
| COLUMN TOTAL | 200 82.3 | 43 17.7 | 243 100.0 |

CORRECTED CHI SQUARE = 1.01544 WITH 1 DEGREE OF FREEDOM
SIGNIFICANCE = 0.3136
RAW CHI SQUARE = 1.54823 WITH 1 DEGREE OF FREEDOM
SIGNIFICANCE = 0.2134
NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 20

* * * * *
 crossstabulation of
 payplan current classification #1 by
 prefdemo i prefer the demo environment #100
 * * * * *

| | | PREFDEMO | | | | ROW TOTAL |
|----------------|---------|----------|------|------|-------|--------------|
| | | I | YES | NO | I | |
| COUNT | ROW PCT | 1. | | 2. | | |
| COL PCT | TOT PCT | I | I | I | I | |
| PAYPLAN | 1. | 139 | 19.2 | 33 | 172 | |
| SCIENTIST | | 80.8 | 19.2 | 19.2 | 68.0 | |
| engineer | | 68.1 | 67.3 | 67.3 | | |
| | | 54.9 | 13.0 | 13.0 | | |
| ADMINISTRATIVE | 2. | 40 | 6 | 6 | 46 | |
| | | 87.0 | 13.0 | 13.0 | 18.2 | |
| | | 19.6 | 12.2 | 12.2 | | |
| | | 15.8 | 2.4 | 2.4 | | |
| SPECIALIST | 3. | 8 | 3 | 3 | 11 | |
| | | 72.7 | 27.3 | 27.3 | 4.3 | |
| | | 3.9 | 6.1 | 6.1 | | |
| | | 3.2 | 1.2 | 1.2 | | |
| TECHNICIAN | 4. | 17 | 7 | 7 | 24 | |
| | | 70.8 | 29.2 | 29.2 | 9.5 | |
| | | 8.3 | 14.3 | 14.3 | | |
| | | 6.7 | 2.8 | 2.8 | | |
| COLUMN | | 204 | 49 | 49 | 253 | |
| TOTAL | | 80.6 | 19.4 | 19.4 | 100.0 | |

2 OUT OF 8 (25.0%) OF THE VALID CELLS HAVE EXPECTED
 CELL FREQUENCY LESS THAN 5.0.
 MINIMUM EXPECTED CELL FREQUENCY = 2.130
 CHI SQUARE = 3.09757
 SIGNIFICANCE = 0.3768
 NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 10

* * * * *
 Crosstabulation of
 entrsupv supervisci at demo entry #3 by
 othtime other use is made of my time #67
 * * * * *

| | | CTHTIME | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | ROW TOTAL |
|----------|-----|---------|------|------|------|------|---|---|-----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|------|--|--------------|
| | | COUNT | I | TRUE | FART | NOT | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | ROW PCT | I | TRUE | TRUE | TRUE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | TOT PCT | I | TRUE | TRUE | TRUE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ENTRSUPV | YES | 1. | 125 | 60.1 | 42 | 30 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 208 | | |
| | | | 83.3 | 77.8 | 16.3 | 11.7 | | | | | | | | | | | | 80.9 | | |
| | | | 48.6 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| NO | 2. | 25 | 51.0 | 12 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 12 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 49 | | | |
| | | 16.7 | 22.2 | 4.7 | 1.9 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 19.1 | | |
| | | 19.7 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| COLUMN | | | 150 | 58.4 | 54 | 35 | 1 | 1 | 18 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 257 | | | |
| TOTAL | | | | | 21.0 | 13.6 | | | 7.0 | | | | | | | | 100.0 | | | |

1 OUT OF 8 (12.5%) OF THE VALID CELLS HAVE EXPECTED CELL
 FREQUENCY LESS THAN 5.0.
 MINIMUM EXPECTED CELL FREQUENCY = 3.432
 CHI SQUARE = 6.01018 WITH 3 DEGREES OF FREEDOM
 SIGNIFICANCE = 0.1111
 NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 6

| INACCPDS | COUNT | | SUPV | | DIVISION head | DEPT head | DIRECTOR | | PROGRAM OFF hd | ROW TOTAL |
|--------------|---------|---------|-------------|------|---------------|-----------|----------|------|----------------|-----------|
| | ROW PCT | COL PCT | BRANCH head | head | | | maj | str | | |
| 1. | 1. | 1. | 19 | 6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.1 | 27 |
| NONE | | | 70.4 | 22.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 7.4 | 12.1 |
| | | | 14.8 | 9.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 11.1 | |
| | | | 8.5 | 2.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.9 | |
| 2. | | | 48 | 25 | 9.6 | 9.6 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 2.4 | 85 |
| 1-10% | | | 56.5 | 29.4 | 10.6 | 10.6 | 33.3 | 33.3 | 11.1 | 38.1 |
| | | | 37.5 | 41.0 | 69.2 | 69.2 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.9 | |
| | | | 21.5 | 11.2 | 4.0 | 4.0 | | | | |
| 3. | | | 31 | 17 | 2 | 2 | 1.8 | 1.8 | 5 | 56 |
| 11-25% | | | 55.4 | 30.4 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 33.3 | 33.3 | 8.9 | 25.1 |
| | | | 24.2 | 27.9 | 15.4 | 15.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 2.2 | |
| | | | 13.9 | 7.6 | 0.9 | 0.9 | | | | |
| 4. | | | 19 | 10 | 2.7 | 2.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4 | 35 |
| 26-50% | | | 54.3 | 28.6 | 5.4 | 5.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 11.4 | 15.7 |
| | | | 14.8 | 16.4 | 15.4 | 15.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 22.2 | |
| | | | 8.5 | 4.5 | 0.9 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.8 | |
| 5. | | | 10 | 2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 17 |
| 51-99% | | | 58.8 | 11.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.9 | 5.9 | 23.5 | 7.6 |
| | | | 7.8 | 3.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 33.3 | 33.3 | 22.2 | |
| | | | 4.5 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 1.8 | |
| 6. | | | 1 | 1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 |
| ALL | | | 33.3 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 33.3 | 1.3 |
| | | | 0.8 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.6 | |
| | | | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.4 | |
| COLUMN TOTAL | | | 128 | 61 | 13 | 13 | 3 | 3 | 18 | 223 |
| | | | 57.4 | 27.4 | 5.8 | 5.8 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 8.1 | 100.0 |

20 OUT OF 30 (66.7%) OF THE VALID CELLS HAVE EXPECTED CELL
 FREQUENCY LESS THAN 5.0.
 MINIMUM EXPECTED CELL FREQUENCY = 0.040
 CHI SQUARE = 24.86649 WITH 20 DEGREES OF FREEDOM
 SIGNIFICANCE = 0.2066
 NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 40


```

** crossstabulation of ** ** ** **
** perinacc percent inaccurate pacs #50 by ** ** **
** organsupv organizational level #2 ** ** **

```

| PERINACC | COUNT | SUPV | | DIVISION head | DEPT head | DIRECTOR | | PROGRAM OFF hd | ROW TOTAL |
|--------------|-------|------|--------------|---------------|-----------|----------|-----|----------------|-----------|
| | | I | IFRANCH head | | | 3. | 4. | | |
| NONE | 1. | I | I | I | I | I | I | I | I |
| | | 106 | 34 | 5 | 1 | 13 | 159 | 62.4 | |
| | | 66 | 21.4 | 3.1 | 0.6 | 8.2 | | | |
| | | 67 | 54.0 | 38.5 | 33.3 | 68.4 | | | |
| 1-10% | | 41 | 13.3 | 2.0 | 0.4 | 5.1 | | | |
| | 2. | I | I | I | I | I | I | I | I |
| | | 44 | 26 | 6 | 2 | 5 | 83 | 32.5 | |
| | | 53 | 31.3 | 7.2 | 2.4 | 6.0 | | | |
| 11-25% | | 28 | 41.3 | 46.2 | 66.7 | 26.3 | | | |
| | | 17 | 10.2 | 2.4 | 0.8 | 2.0 | | | |
| | 3. | I | I | I | I | I | I | I | I |
| | | 6 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 12 | 4.7 | |
| 51-99% | | 50 | 25.0 | 16.7 | 0.0 | 8.3 | | | |
| | | 3 | 4.8 | 15.4 | 0.0 | 5.3 | | | |
| | | 2 | 1.2 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 0.4 | | | |
| | 5. | I | I | I | I | I | I | I | I |
| | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0.4 | |
| | 100 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | |
| | 0 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | |
| | 0 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | |
| COLUMN TOTAL | | I | I | I | I | I | I | I | I |
| | | 157 | 63 | 13 | 3 | 19 | 255 | 100.0 | |
| | | 61.6 | 24.7 | 5.1 | 1.2 | 7.5 | | | |

12 OUT OF 20 (60.0%) OF THE VALID CELLS HAVE EXPECTED CELL
FREQUENCY LESS THAN 5.0. FREQUENCY = 0.012
MINIMUM EXPECTED CELL FREQUENCY WITH 12 DEGREES OF FREEDOM
CHI SQUARE = 11.77630
SIGNIFICANCE = 0.4638
NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 8

| COUNT | SUPV | | | DIVISION | DEPT | DIRECTOR | | PROGRAM | ROW |
|----------------|------|--------|------|----------|------|----------|-----|---------|-------|
| | I | BRANCH | head | | | head | stf | | |
| ROW PCT | 1. | 2. | 3. | 4. | 5. | | | | TOTAL |
| COL PCT | 1. | 2. | 3. | 4. | 5. | | | | |
| TOT PCT | 1. | 2. | 3. | 4. | 5. | | | | |
| USEPACS | 1. | 24 | 13 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 17.5 |
| LESS THAN PDS | 1. | 54.5 | 29.5 | 9.1 | 0.0 | 6.8 | 0 | 3 | 44 |
| | | 15.5 | 21.0 | 30.8 | 0.0 | 15.8 | 0 | 8 | 17.5 |
| | | 9.5 | 5.2 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 1.2 | 0 | 2 | 4 |
| ABOUT THE SAME | 2. | 85 | 32 | 8 | 1 | 9 | 1 | 9 | 135 |
| | | 63.0 | 23.7 | 5.9 | 0.7 | 6.7 | 0 | 7 | 53.6 |
| | | 54.8 | 51.6 | 61.5 | 33.3 | 47.4 | 3 | 4 | |
| | | 33.7 | 12.7 | 3.2 | 0.4 | 3.6 | 0 | 6 | |
| MORE THAN PDS | 3. | 46 | 17 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 2 | 7 | 73 |
| | | 63.0 | 23.3 | 1.4 | 2.7 | 9.6 | 7 | 6 | 29.0 |
| | | 29.7 | 27.4 | 7.7 | 66.7 | 36.8 | 7 | 8 | |
| | | 18.3 | 6.7 | 0.4 | 0.8 | 2.8 | 0 | 8 | |
| COLUMN TOTAL | | 155 | 62 | 13 | 3 | 19 | 3 | 19 | 252 |
| | | 61.5 | 24.6 | 5.2 | 1.2 | 7.5 | 1 | 2 | 100.0 |

6 OUT OF 15 (40.0%) OF THE VALID CELLS HAVE EXPECTED CELL FREQUENCY LESS THAN 5.0.
MINIMUM EXPECTED CELL FREQUENCY = 0.524
CHI SQUARE = 7.225540 WITH 8 DEGREES OF FREEDOM
SIGNIFICANCE = 0.5093
NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 11

MISCON'T

[illegible]

4 OUT OF 12 (33.3%) OF THE VALID CELLS HAVE EXPECTED CELL
FREQUENCY LESS THAN 5.0.
MINIMUM EXPECTED CELL FREQUENCY = 0.688
CHI SQUARE = 4.62357 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM
SIGNIFICANCE = 0.5929
NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 7

| CATEGORY LABEL | PAYPLAN | CURRENT CLASSIFICATION #1 | | | | ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT) | CUM FREQ (PCT) |
|--------------------|---------|---------------------------|------------------|---------------------------|------|---------------------------|----------------------|
| | | CODE | ABSOLUTE FREQ | RELATIVE FREQ (PCT) | | | |
| SCIENTIST ENGINEER | | 1. | 178 | 67.7 | 67.7 | 67.7 | |
| ADMINISTRATIVE | | 2. | 49 | 18.6 | 18.6 | 86.3 | |
| SPECIALIST | | 3. | 12 | 4.6 | 4.6 | 90.9 | |
| TECHNICIAN | | 4. | 24 | 9.1 | 9.1 | 100.0 | |
| | | TOTAL | 263 | 100.0 | --- | --- | |
| | | MEAN 1.551 | | MEDIAN 1.239 | | | |

| CATEGORY LABEL | SUPV | ORGANIZATIONAL LEVEL #2 | ABSOLUTE FREQ | RELATIVE FREQ (PCT) | ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT) | CUM FREQ (PCT) |
|----------------------|------|-------------------------|---------------|---------------------|---------------------|----------------|
| BRANCH HEAD | | 1. | 163 | 62.0 | 62.2 | 62.2 |
| DIVISION HEAD | | 2. | 64 | 24.3 | 24.4 | 86.6 |
| DEPT HEAD | | 3. | 13 | 4.9 | 5.0 | 91.6 |
| DIRECTOR MAJOR STAFF | | 4. | 3 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 92.7 |
| PROGRAM OFFICE HEAD | | 5. | 19 | 7.2 | 7.3 | 100.0 |
| NO RESPONSE | | 0. | 1 | 0.4 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | | TOTAL | 263 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| | | MEAN 1.668 | | MEDIAN 1.304 | | |

| ENTRSUPV SUPERVISOR AT DEMO ENTRY #3 | | RELATIVE | | ADJUSTED | | CUM | |
|--------------------------------------|------|------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| CATEGORY LABEL | CCLE | ABSOLUTE FREQ | FREQ (PCT) | FREQ (PCT) | FREQ (PCT) | FREQ (PCT) | FREQ (PCT) |
| YES | 1. | 210 | 79.8 | 80.2 | 80.2 | | |
| NO | 2. | 52 | 19.8 | 19.8 | 100.0 | | |
| NO RESPONSE | 0. | 1 | 0.4 | MISSING | 100.0 | | |
| | | TOTAL | 263 | 100.0 | | | |
| MEAN 1.198 | | MEDIAN 1.124 | | | | | |

| LEVEL SUPERVISORY LEVEL AT ENTRY #4 | | RELATIVE | | ADJUSTED | | CUM | |
|-------------------------------------|------|------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| CATEGORY LABEL | CODE | ABSOLUTE FREQ | FREQ (PCT) | FREQ (PCT) | FREQ (PCT) | FREQ (PCT) | FREQ (PCT) |
| SAME LEVEL | 1. | 168 | 63.9 | 78.1 | 78.1 | | |
| LOWER LEVEL | 2. | 47 | 17.9 | 21.9 | 100.0 | | |
| NO RESPONSE | 0. | 48 | 18.3 | MISSING | 100.0 | | |
| | | TOTAL | 263 | 100.0 | | | |
| MEAN 1.219 | | MEDIAN 1.140 | | | | | |

WRITPD AUTHOR OF GENERAL SCHEDULE PDS #5

CATEGORY LABEL
YOURSELF
SUB-SUPERVISOR
STAFF ASST
EMPLOYEE
NO RESPONSE

CCODE

1.
2.
3.
4.
0.

ABSOLUTE
FREQ

161
26
24
10
42

RELATIVE
FREQ
(PCT)

61.2
9.9
9.1
3.8
16.0

ADJUSTED
FREQ
(PCT)

72.9
11.8
10.9
4.5
MISSING

CUM
FREQ
(PCT)

72.9
84.6
95.5
100.0
100.0

TOTAL 263

MEAN 1.471 MEDIAN 1.186

PDHOURS HOURS PREFAKING GS-14 15 PDS #6

CATEGORY LABEL
UNDER 4 HOURS
4-8 HOURS
9-16 HOURS
OVER 16 HOURS
N A
NO RESPONSE

CCODE

1.
2.
3.
4.
5.
0.

ABSOLUTE
FREQ

18
16
11
22
147
49

RELATIVE
FREQ
(PCT)

6.8
6.1
4.2
8.4
55.9
18.6

ADJUSTED
FREQ
(PCT)

8.4
7.5
5.1
10.3
68.7
MISSING

CUM
FREQ
(PCT)

8.4
15.9
21.0
31.3
100.0
100.0

TOTAL 263

MEAN 4.234 MEDIAN 4.772

| PDHOURSE HOURS PREPARING GS-13 PDS #7 | |
|---------------------------------------|--------------|
| CATEGORY LABEL | CCODE |
| UNDER 4 HOURS | 1. |
| 4-8 HOURS | 2. |
| 9-16 HOURS | 3. |
| OVER 16 HOURS | 4. |
| N A | 5. |
| NO RESPONSE | 0. |
| | TOTAL |
| | 263 |
| | MEAN 3.541 |
| | MEDIAN 3.850 |

| ABSOLUTE FREQ | RELATIVE FREQ (PCT) | ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT) | CUM FREQ (PCT) |
|---------------|---------------------|---------------------|----------------|
| 24 | 9.1 | 11.0 | 11.0 |
| 40 | 15.2 | 18.3 | 29.4 |
| 31 | 11.8 | 14.2 | 43.6 |
| 40 | 15.2 | 18.3 | 61.9 |
| 83 | 31.6 | 38.1 | 100.0 |
| 45 | 17.1 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

| PDHOURSC HOURS PREPARING GS-12 SEE PDS #8 | |
|---|--------------|
| CATEGORY LABEL | CCODE |
| UNDER 4 HOURS | 1. |
| 4-8 HOURS | 2. |
| 9-16 HOURS | 3. |
| OVER 16 HOURS | 4. |
| N A | 5. |
| NO RESPONSE | 0. |
| | TOTAL |
| | 263 |
| | MEAN 3.042 |
| | MEDIAN 2.712 |

| ABSOLUTE FREQ | RELATIVE FREQ (PCT) | ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT) | CUM FREQ (PCT) |
|---------------|---------------------|---------------------|----------------|
| 40 | 15.2 | 18.6 | 18.6 |
| 62 | 23.6 | 28.8 | 47.4 |
| 26 | 9.9 | 12.1 | 59.5 |
| 23 | 8.7 | 10.7 | 70.2 |
| 64 | 24.3 | 29.8 | 100.0 |
| 48 | 18.3 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

| PDDAYS | CATEGORY LABEL | DAYS FOR CLASSIFICATION | GS-14 | 15 | #12 |
|--------|----------------|-------------------------|----------|------------|------------|
| | | | ABSOLUTE | RELATIVE | ADJUSTED |
| | | CODE | FREQ | FREQ (PCT) | FREQ (PCT) |
| | UNDER 4 DAYS | 1. | 2 | 0.8 | 0.9 |
| | 4-8 DAYS | 2. | 4 | 1.5 | 2.8 |
| | 9-16 DAYS | 3. | 4 | 1.5 | 4.7 |
| | 17-30 DAYS | 4. | 16 | 6.1 | 12.1 |
| | OVER 30 DAYS | 5. | 49 | 18.6 | 35.0 |
| | N A | 6. | 139 | 52.9 | 100.0 |
| | NO RESPONSE | 0. | 49 | 18.6 | 100.0 |
| | | TOTAL | 263 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| | | MEAN | 5.444 | | |
| | | MEDIAN | 5.730 | | |

| PDDAYS | CATEGORY LABEL | DAYS FOR CLASSIFICATION | GS-13 | #13 |
|--------|----------------|-------------------------|----------|------------|
| | | | ABSOLUTE | RELATIVE |
| | | CODE | FREQ | FREQ (PCT) |
| | UNDER 4 DAYS | 1. | 2 | 0.8 |
| | 4-8 DAYS | 2. | 7 | 2.7 |
| | 9-16 DAYS | 3. | 11 | 4.2 |
| | 17-30 DAYS | 4. | 47 | 17.9 |
| | OVER 30 DAYS | 5. | 71 | 27.0 |
| | N A | 6. | 78 | 29.7 |
| | NO RESPONSE | 0. | 47 | 17.9 |
| | | TOTAL | 263 | 100.0 |
| | | MEAN | 4.907 | |
| | | MEDIAN | 5.077 | |

| CATEGORY LABEL | PDDAYSC | DAYS | FCR | CLASS | GS-12 | SEE #14 | RELATIVE | ADJUSTED | CUM |
|----------------|---------|------|------|-------|----------|---------|----------|----------|-------|
| | | | CODE | | ABSOLUTE | FREQ | (PCT) | FREQ | FREQ |
| | | | | | | | | (PCT) | (PCT) |
| UNDER 4 DAYS | | | 1. | | 11 | 4.2 | 5.1 | 5.1 | 5.1 |
| 4-8 DAYS | | | 2. | | 16 | 6.1 | 7.5 | 12.6 | 12.6 |
| 9-16 DAYS | | | 3. | | 44 | 16.7 | 20.8 | 33.2 | 33.2 |
| 17-30 DAYS | | | 4. | | 53 | 20.2 | 24.8 | 57.9 | 57.9 |
| OVER 30 DAYS | | | 5. | | 30 | 11.4 | 14.0 | 72.0 | 72.0 |
| N A | | | 6. | | 60 | 22.8 | 28.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| NO RESPONSE | | | 0. | | 49 | 18.6 | MISSING | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | TOTAL | 263 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| | | | | | MEAN | 4.192 | | | |
| | | | | | | | MEDIAN | 4.179 | |

| CATEGORY LABEL | PDLAYSD | DAYS | FCR | CLASS | GS-12 | TAS #15 | RELATIVE | ADJUSTED | CUM |
|----------------|---------|------|------|-------|----------|---------|----------|----------|-------|
| | | | CODE | | ABSOLUTE | FREQ | (PCT) | FREQ | FREQ |
| | | | | | | | | (PCT) | (PCT) |
| UNDER 4 DAYS | | | 1. | | 9 | 3.4 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 4.2 |
| 4-8 DAYS | | | 2. | | 14 | 5.3 | 6.6 | 10.8 | 10.8 |
| 9-16 DAYS | | | 3. | | 29 | 11.0 | 13.7 | 24.5 | 24.5 |
| 17-30 DAYS | | | 4. | | 60 | 22.8 | 28.3 | 52.8 | 52.8 |
| OVER 30 DAYS | | | 5. | | 44 | 16.7 | 20.8 | 73.6 | 73.6 |
| N A | | | 6. | | 56 | 21.3 | 26.4 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| NO RESPONSE | | | 0. | | 51 | 19.4 | MISSING | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | TOTAL | 263 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| | | | | | MEAN | 4.340 | | | |
| | | | | | | | MEDIAN | 4.400 | |

| PDDAYSE | DAYS FOR CLASSIFICATION | ALL PDS #16 | RELATIVE | ADJUSTED | CUM |
|----------------|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|------------|------------|
| | | ABSOLUTE | FREQ (PCT) | FREQ (PCT) | FREQ (PCT) |
| CATEGORY LABEL | CODE | FREQ | | | |
| UNDER 4 DAYS | 1. | 17 | 6.5 | 7.8 | 7.8 |
| 4-8 DAYS | 2. | 30 | 11.4 | 13.8 | 21.7 |
| 9-16 DAYS | 3. | 54 | 20.5 | 24.9 | 46.5 |
| 17-30 DAYS | 4. | 58 | 22.1 | 26.7 | 73.3 |
| OVER 30 DAYS | 5. | 46 | 17.5 | 21.2 | 94.5 |
| N A | 6. | 12 | 4.6 | 5.5 | 100.0 |
| NO RESPONSE | 0. | 46 | 17.5 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | TOTAL | 263 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| | MEAN 3.562 | | MEDIAN 3.629 | | |

| NUMFDSA | GS-14 | 15 | PDS PREPARED #18 | RELATIVE | ADJUSTED | CUM |
|----------------|------------|----|------------------|--------------|------------|------------|
| | | | ABSOLUTE | FREQ (PCT) | FREQ (PCT) | FREQ (PCT) |
| CATEGORY LABEL | CODE | | FREQ | | | |
| NONE | 1. | | 160 | 60.8 | 73.7 | 73.7 |
| 1-3 PDS | 2. | | 52 | 19.8 | 24.0 | 97.7 |
| 4-10 PDS | 3. | | 2 | 0.8 | 0.9 | 98.6 |
| OVER 40 PDS | 6. | | 3 | 1.1 | 1.4 | 100.0 |
| NO RESPONSE | 0. | | 46 | 17.5 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | TOTAL | | 263 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| | MEAN 1.327 | | | MEDIAN 1.178 | | |

| CATEGORY LABEL | NUMPDSB | GS-13 PDS PREPARED #19 | ABSOLUTE FREQ | RELATIVE FREQ (PCT) | ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT) | CUM FREQ (PCT) |
|----------------|------------|------------------------|---------------|---------------------|---------------------|----------------|
| NCNE | | CCODE | | | | |
| 1-3 PDS | | 1. | 94 | 35.7 | 43.1 | 43.1 |
| 4-10 PDS | | 2. | 114 | 43.3 | 52.3 | 95.4 |
| OVER 40 PDS | | 3. | 2 | 0.8 | 3.7 | 99.1 |
| NO RESPONSE | | 6. | 45 | 17.1 | 0.9 | 100.0 |
| | | 0. | | | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | | TOTAL | 263 | 100.0 | | |
| | MEAN 1.642 | | | | | |
| | | MEDIAN 1.632 | | | | |

| CATEGORY LABEL | NUMPDSC | GS-12 S&E PDS PREPARED #20 | ABSOLUTE FREQ | RELATIVE FREQ (PCT) | ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT) | CUM FREQ (PCT) |
|----------------|------------|----------------------------|---------------|---------------------|---------------------|----------------|
| NONE | | CCODE | | | | |
| 1-3 PDS | | 1. | 66 | 25.1 | 30.7 | 30.7 |
| 4-10 PDS | | 2. | 108 | 41.1 | 50.2 | 80.9 |
| 11-20 PDS | | 3. | 39 | 14.8 | 18.1 | 99.1 |
| NO RESPONSE | | 4. | 2 | 0.8 | 0.9 | 100.0 |
| | | 0. | 48 | 18.3 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | | TOTAL | 263 | 100.0 | | |
| | MEAN 1.893 | | | | | |
| | | MEDIAN 1.884 | | | | |

| CATEGORY LABEL | INACCIDS | NUMBER OF INACCURATE | PDS #24 | RELATIVE | ADJUSTED | CUM |
|----------------|----------|----------------------|---------|----------|----------|-------|
| | | | FREQ | FREQ | FREQ | FREQ |
| | | | (PCT) | (PCT) | (PCT) | (PCT) |
| NONE | | | 27 | 10.3 | 12.1 | 12.1 |
| 1-10% | | | 85 | 32.3 | 37.9 | 50.0 |
| 11-25% | | | 57 | 21.7 | 25.4 | 75.4 |
| 26-50% | | | 35 | 13.3 | 15.6 | 91.1 |
| 51-99% | | | 17 | 6.5 | 7.6 | 98.7 |
| ALL | | | 3 | 1.1 | 1.3 | 100.0 |
| NO RESPONSE | | | 39 | 14.8 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | | | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | | TOTAL | 263 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| MEAN | 2.728 | MEDIAN | 2.500 | | | |

| CATEGORY LABEL | HOWINACC | DEGREE OF INACCURACY | #25 | RELATIVE | ADJUSTED | CUM |
|----------------|----------|----------------------|-------|----------|----------|-------|
| | | | FREQ | FREQ | FREQ | FREQ |
| | | | (PCT) | (PCT) | (PCT) | (PCT) |
| MAJOR | | | 26 | 9.9 | 12.1 | 12.1 |
| MINOR | | | 189 | 71.9 | 87.9 | 100.0 |
| NO RESPONSE | | | 48 | 18.3 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | | | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | | TOTAL | 263 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| MEAN | 1.879 | MEDIAN | 1.931 | | | |

| REASONC | MAJOR PURPOSE FOR USING PD #30 | ABSOLUTE FREQ | RELATIVE FREQ (PCT) | ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT) | CUM FREQ (PCT) |
|--------------------|--------------------------------|---------------|---------------------|---------------------|----------------|
| CATEGORY LABEL | CCODE | | | | |
| PERF APPRAISAL | 1. | 6 | 2.3 | 3.8 | 3.8 |
| INSTRUCT EMPLOYEES | 2. | 4 | 1.5 | 2.5 | 6.3 |
| REQUIRED REVIEWS | 3. | 15 | 5.7 | 9.5 | 15.8 |
| PSN MGMT DECISIONS | 4. | 7 | 2.7 | 4.4 | 20.3 |
| MANPWR PLANNING | 5. | 4 | 1.5 | 2.5 | 22.8 |
| RECRUITMENT | 6. | 33 | 12.5 | 20.9 | 43.7 |
| MAKE ASSIGNMENTS | 7. | 4 | 1.5 | 2.5 | 46.2 |
| PROMOTION | 8. | 75 | 28.5 | 47.5 | 93.7 |
| REASSIGNMENT | 9. | 10 | 3.8 | 6.3 | 100.0 |
| NO RESPONSE | 0. | 105 | 39.9 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | TOTAL | 263 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| | MEAN 6.475 | | | | |
| | | | MEDIAN 7.580 | | |

| REASONC | MAJOR PURPOSE FOR USING PD #31 | ABSOLUTE FREQ | RELATIVE FREQ (PCT) | ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT) | CUM FREQ (PCT) |
|--------------------|--------------------------------|---------------|---------------------|---------------------|----------------|
| CATEGORY LABEL | CCODE | | | | |
| PERF APPRAISAL | 1. | 6 | 2.3 | 9.0 | 9.0 |
| INSTRUCT EMPLOYEES | 2. | 2 | 0.8 | 3.0 | 11.9 |
| REQUIRED REVIEWS | 3. | 5 | 1.9 | 7.5 | 19.4 |
| PSN MGMT DECISIONS | 4. | 4 | 1.5 | 6.0 | 25.4 |
| MANPWR PLANNING | 5. | 9 | 3.4 | 13.4 | 38.8 |
| RECRUITMENT | 6. | 5 | 1.9 | 7.5 | 46.3 |
| MAKE ASSIGNMENTS | 7. | 3 | 1.1 | 4.3 | 50.7 |
| PROMOTION | 8. | 21 | 8.0 | 31.9 | 82.1 |
| REASSIGNMENT | 9. | 12 | 4.6 | 17.9 | 100.0 |
| NO RESPONSE | 0. | 196 | 74.5 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | TOTAL | 263 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| | MEAN 6.164 | | | | |
| | | | MEDIAN 7.333 | | |

| HOWUSE | HOW USEFUL WERE PDS TO YOU #32 | ABSOLUTE | RELATIVE | ADJUSTED | CUM |
|-----------------|--------------------------------|----------|--------------|------------|------------|
| CATEGORY LABEL | CODE | FREQ | FREQ (PCT) | FREQ (PCT) | FREQ (PCT) |
| VERY USEFUL | 1. | 16 | 6.1 | 7.2 | 7.2 |
| MODERATE USE | 2. | 117 | 44.5 | 52.9 | 60.2 |
| NOT USEFUL | 3. | 63 | 24.0 | 28.5 | 88.7 |
| IRRELEVANT | 4. | 20 | 7.6 | 9.0 | 97.7 |
| INTERFERE W JOB | 5. | 5 | 1.9 | 2.3 | 100.0 |
| NO RESPONSE | 0. | 42 | 16.0 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | TOTAL | 263 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| | MEAN 2.462 | | MEDIAN 2.308 | | |

| NONSUPV | NONSUPV INVOLVEMENT IN CLASS #33 | ABSOLUTE | RELATIVE | ADJUSTED | CUM |
|---------------------|----------------------------------|----------|--------------|------------|------------|
| CATEGORY LABEL | CODE | FREQ | FREQ (PCT) | FREQ (PCT) | FREQ (PCT) |
| LITTLE NC INVOLVEMT | 1. | 58 | 22.1 | 26.1 | 26.1 |
| KNCW PFFIMARY USES | 2. | 155 | 58.9 | 69.8 | 95.9 |
| THOROUGH UNDERSTAND | 3. | 9 | 3.4 | 4.1 | 100.0 |
| NO RESPONSE | 0. | 41 | 15.6 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | TOTAL | 263 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| | MEAN 1.779 | | MEDIAN 1.842 | | |

WRITEEY PACS ARE USUALLY WRITTEN BY #34

| CATEGORY LABEL | CCDE | ABSOLUTE FREQ | RELATIVE FREQ (PCT) | ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT) | CUM FREQ (PCT) |
|----------------|------|------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|
| YOURSELF | 1. | 153 | 58.2 | 60.0 | 60.0 |
| SUB SUPERVISOR | 2. | 38 | 14.4 | 14.9 | 74.9 |
| STAFF ASST | 3. | 15 | 5.7 | 5.9 | 80.8 |
| EMPLOYEE | 4. | 49 | 18.6 | 19.2 | 100.0 |
| NO RESPONSE | 0. | 8 | 3.0 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | | TOTAL | 263 | 100.0 | |
| | | MEAN | 1.843 | | |
| | | | | | MEDIAN 1.333 |

PREFPHRSA HOURS SPENT ON PREP DP-4 PAC #35

| CATEGORY LABEL | CODE | ABSOLUTE FREQ | RELATIVE FREQ (PCT) | ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT) | CUM FREQ (PCT) |
|----------------|------|------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|
| UNDER 1 HOUR | 1. | 57 | 21.7 | 22.8 | 22.8 |
| 1-3 HOURS | 2. | 33 | 12.5 | 13.2 | 36.0 |
| 4-8 HOURS | 3. | 4 | 1.5 | 1.6 | 37.6 |
| 9-16 HOURS | 4. | 1 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 38.0 |
| OVER 16 HOURS | 5. | 3 | 1.1 | 1.2 | 39.2 |
| NCNE | 6. | 152 | 57.8 | 60.8 | 100.0 |
| NO RESPONSE | 0. | 13 | 4.9 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | | TOTAL | 263 | 100.0 | |
| | | MEAN | 4.264 | | |
| | | | | | MEDIAN 5.678 |

| CATEGORY LABEL | PREPHRSD | HCURS | SPENT ON PREP | LEVEL A, 182 #38 | RELATIVE FREQ (PCT) | ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT) | CUM FREQ (PCT) |
|----------------|----------|-------|---------------|------------------|---------------------|---------------------|----------------|
| UNDER 1 HOUR | | | CODE | ABSOLUTE FREQ | | | |
| 1-3 HOURS | | | 1. | 137 | 52.1 | 53.7 | 53.7 |
| 4-8 HOURS | | | 2. | 61 | 23.2 | 23.9 | 77.6 |
| 9-16 HOURS | | | 3. | 23 | 8.7 | 9.0 | 86.6 |
| OVER 16 HOURS | | | 4. | 5 | 1.9 | 2.0 | 88.6 |
| NONE | | | 5. | 2 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 89.4 |
| NO RESPONSE | | | 6. | 27 | 10.3 | 10.6 | 100.0 |
| | | | 0. | 8 | 3.0 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | | | TOTAL | 263 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| | | | MEAN | 2.039 | | | |
| | | | | | MEDIAN | 1.431 | |

| CATEGORY LABEL | APPDAYS | DAYS TO CLASSIFY | DF-4 | PAC #40 | RELATIVE FREQ (PCT) | ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT) | CUM FREQ (PCT) |
|----------------|---------|------------------|-------|---------------|---------------------|---------------------|----------------|
| 1-3 DAYS | | | CODE | ABSOLUTE FREQ | | | |
| 4-8 DAYS | | | 1. | 23 | 8.7 | 9.4 | 9.4 |
| 9-16 DAYS | | | 2. | 33 | 12.5 | 13.5 | 22.9 |
| 16-30 DAYS | | | 3. | 16 | 6.1 | 6.5 | 29.4 |
| OVER 30 DAYS | | | 4. | 12 | 4.6 | 4.9 | 34.3 |
| NONE | | | 5. | 8 | 3.0 | 3.3 | 37.6 |
| NO RESPONSE | | | 6. | 153 | 58.2 | 62.4 | 100.0 |
| | | | 0. | 18 | 6.8 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | | | TOTAL | 263 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| | | | MEAN | 4.665 | | | |
| | | | | | MEDIAN | 5.699 | |

| CATEGORY LABEL | APPELAYSE | DAYS TO CLASSIFY | DF-3 | PAC #41 | RELATIVE | ADJUSTED | CUM |
|----------------|-----------|------------------|----------|---------|----------|----------|-------|
| | | CCODE | ABSOLUTE | FREQ | (PCT) | FREQ | FREQ |
| | | | PRFQ | | | (PCT) | (PCT) |
| 1-3 DAYS | | 1. | 59 | 22.4 | 23.3 | 33.3 | 33.3 |
| 4-8 DAYS | | 2. | 80 | 30.4 | 31.6 | 54.9 | 54.9 |
| 9-16 DAYS | | 3. | 41 | 15.6 | 16.2 | 71.1 | 71.1 |
| 16-30 DAYS | | 4. | 22 | 8.4 | 18.7 | 79.8 | 79.8 |
| OVER 30 DAYS | | 5. | 11 | 4.2 | 4.3 | 84.2 | 84.2 |
| NONE | | 6. | 40 | 15.2 | 15.8 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| NO RESPONSE | | 0. | 10 | 3.8 | MISSING | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| | | | TOTAL | 263 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| | | | MEAN | 2.866 | MEDIAN | 2.344 | |

| CATEGORY LABEL | APPELAYSC | DAYS TO CLASSIFY | DT S | A-3 | PAC #42 | RELATIVE | ADJUSTED | CUM |
|----------------|-----------|------------------|----------|-------|---------|----------|----------|-------|
| | | CCODE | ABSOLUTE | FREQ | (PCT) | FREQ | FREQ | FREQ |
| | | | PRFQ | | | (PCT) | (PCT) | (PCT) |
| 1-3 DAYS | | 1. | 55 | 20.9 | 22.3 | 22.3 | 22.3 | 22.3 |
| 4-8 DAYS | | 2. | 76 | 28.9 | 30.8 | 53.0 | 53.0 | 53.0 |
| 9-16 DAYS | | 3. | 48 | 18.3 | 19.4 | 72.5 | 72.5 | 72.5 |
| 16-30 DAYS | | 4. | 25 | 9.5 | 10.1 | 82.6 | 82.6 | 82.6 |
| OVER 30 DAYS | | 5. | 11 | 4.2 | 4.5 | 87.0 | 87.0 | 87.0 |
| NONE | | 6. | 32 | 12.2 | 13.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| NO RESPONSE | | 0. | 16 | 6.1 | MISSING | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| | | | TOTAL | 263 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | |
| | | | MEAN | 2.826 | MEDIAN | 2.401 | | |

| APPDAYS | DAYS TO CLASSIFY | LEVEL A, 182 | PAC #43 |
|----------------|------------------|---------------|---------------------|
| CATEGORY LABEL | CCODE | ABSOLUTE FREQ | RELATIVE FREQ (PCT) |
| 1-3 DAYS | 1. | 65 | 24.7 |
| 4-8 DAYS | 2. | 87 | 33.1 |
| 9-16 DAYS | 3. | 37 | 14.1 |
| 16-30 DAYS | 4. | 24 | 9.1 |
| OVER 30 DAYS | 5. | 13 | 4.9 |
| NONE | 6. | 28 | 10.6 |
| NO RESPONSE | 0. | 9 | 3.4 |
| | TOTAL | 263 | 100.0 |
| | MEAN | 2.673 | |
| | | | MEDIAN 2.213 |

| ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT) | CUM FREQ (PCT) |
|---------------------|----------------|
| 25.6 | 25.6 |
| 34.3 | 59.8 |
| 14.6 | 74.4 |
| 9.4 | 83.9 |
| 5.1 | 89.0 |
| 11.0 | 100.0 |
| MISSING | 100.0 |

| PACSYRA | NUMBER PACS PER YEAR | DP-4 #45 |
|----------------|----------------------|---------------------|
| CATEGORY LABEL | CCODE | RELATIVE FREQ (PCT) |
| NONE | 1. | 3.0 |
| 1-3 PACS | 2. | 19.8 |
| 4-10 PACS | 3. | 1.5 |
| OVER 40 PACS | 6. | 2.7 |
| NO RESPONSE | 0. | 3.0 |
| | TOTAL | 263 |
| | MEAN | 1.373 |
| | | |
| | | MEDIAN 1.164 |

| ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT) | CUM FREQ (PCT) |
|---------------------|----------------|
| 75.3 | 75.3 |
| 20.4 | 95.7 |
| 1.6 | 97.3 |
| 2.7 | 100.0 |
| MISSING | 100.0 |

| PACSYRD | NUMBER PACS PER YEAR | LEVEL A, 1&2 #48 | RELATIVE FREQ (PCT) | ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT) | CUM FREQ (PCT) |
|----------------|----------------------|------------------|---------------------|---------------------|----------------|
| CATEGORY LABEL | CODE | ABSOLUTE FREQ | | | |
| NONE | 1. | 44 | 16.7 | 17.1 | 17.1 |
| 1-3 PACS | 2. | 145 | 55.1 | 56.2 | 73.3 |
| 4-10 PACS | 3. | 52 | 19.8 | 20.2 | 93.4 |
| 11-20 PACS | 4. | 14 | 5.3 | 5.4 | 98.8 |
| 21-40 PACS | 5. | 2 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 99.6 |
| OVER 40 PACS | 6. | 1 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 100.0 |
| NO RESPONSE | 0. | 5 | 1.9 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | TOTAL | 263 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| | MEAN 2.178 | | MEDIAN 2.086 | | |

| PERINACC | PERCENT INACCURATE | PACS #50 | RELATIVE FREQ (PCT) | ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT) | CUM FREQ (PCT) |
|----------------|--------------------|---------------|---------------------|---------------------|----------------|
| CATEGORY LABEL | CCODE | ABSOLUTE FREQ | | | |
| NONE | 1. | 160 | 60.8 | 62.5 | 62.5 |
| 1-10% | 2. | 83 | 31.6 | 32.4 | 94.9 |
| 11-25% | 3. | 12 | 4.6 | 4.7 | 99.6 |
| 51-99% | 5. | 1 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 100.0 |
| NO RESPONSE | 0. | 7 | 2.7 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | TOTAL | 263 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| | MEAN 1.434 | | MEDIAN 1.300 | | |

| PACPURPB PACS ARE USED FOR #53 | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|-------|------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|
| CATEGORY LABEL | CCODE | ABSOLUTE FREQ | RELATIVE FREQ (PCT) | ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT) | CUM FREQ (PCT) |
| PERF APPRAISAL | 1. | 7 | 2.7 | 3.1 | 3.1 |
| INSTRUCT EMPLOYEES | 2. | 33 | 12.5 | 14.7 | 17.9 |
| REQUIRED REVIEWS | 3. | 87 | 33.1 | 38.8 | 56.7 |
| PSN MGMT DECISIONS | 4. | 11 | 4.2 | 4.9 | 61.6 |
| MANPWR PLANNING | 5. | 5 | 1.9 | 2.2 | 63.8 |
| RECRUITMENT | 6. | 32 | 12.2 | 14.3 | 78.1 |
| MAKE ASSIGNMENTS | 7. | 6 | 2.3 | 2.7 | 80.8 |
| PROMOTION | 8. | 40 | 15.2 | 17.9 | 98.7 |
| REASSIGNMENT | 9. | 3 | 1.1 | 1.3 | 100.0 |
| NO RESPONSE | 0. | 39 | 14.8 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| TOTAL | | 263 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| MEAN 4.393 | | MEDIAN 3.328 | | | |

| PACPURPC PACS ARE USED FOR #54 | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|-------|------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|
| CATEGORY LABEL | CCODE | ABSOLUTE FREQ | RELATIVE FREQ (PCT) | ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT) | CUM FREQ (PCT) |
| PERF APPRAISAL | 1. | 6 | 2.3 | 3.1 | 3.1 |
| INSTRUCT EMPLOYEES | 2. | 8 | 3.0 | 4.2 | 7.3 |
| REQUIRED REVIEWS | 3. | 20 | 7.6 | 10.4 | 17.7 |
| PSN MGMT DECISIONS | 4. | 17 | 6.5 | 8.9 | 26.6 |
| MANPWR PLANNING | 5. | 10 | 3.8 | 5.2 | 31.8 |
| RECRUITMENT | 6. | 44 | 16.7 | 22.9 | 54.7 |
| MAKE ASSIGNMENTS | 7. | 7 | 2.7 | 3.6 | 58.3 |
| PROMOTION | 8. | 66 | 25.1 | 34.4 | 92.7 |
| REASSIGNMENT | 9. | 14 | 5.3 | 7.3 | 100.0 |
| NO RESPONSE | 0. | 71 | 27.0 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| TOTAL | | 263 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| MEAN 6.078 | | MEDIAN 6.295 | | | |

| EACFURPD PACS ARE USED FOR #55 | | | | |
|--------------------------------|------------|------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| CATEGORY LABEL | CCODE | ABSOLUTE FREQ | RELATIVE FREQ (PCT) | ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT) |
| PERF APPRAISAL | 1. | 3 | 1.1 | 2.6 |
| YEFS | 2. | 6 | 2.3 | 5.9 |
| INSTRUC EMPLOYEES | 3. | 8 | 3.0 | 7.9 |
| REVIEWED DECISIONS | 4. | 9 | 3.4 | 14.8 |
| PSN MGMT PLANNING | 5. | 4 | 1.5 | 22.8 |
| MANPWR PLANNING | 6. | 12 | 4.6 | 26.3 |
| RECRUITMENT | 7. | 11 | 4.2 | 36.8 |
| MAKE ASSIGNMENTS | 8. | 39 | 14.8 | 46.5 |
| PROMOTION | 9. | 22 | 8.4 | 80.7 |
| REASSIGNMENT | 0. | 149 | 56.7 | 100.0 |
| NO RESPONSE | | | | 100.0 |
| | TOTAL | 263 | 100.0 | |
| | MEAN 6.614 | | | |
| | | MEDIAN 7.603 | | |

| PACUSE HOW USEFUL ARE PACS #56 | | | | |
|--------------------------------|------------|------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| CATEGORY LABEL | CODE | ABSOLUTE FREQ | RELATIVE FREQ (PCT) | ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT) |
| VERY USEFUL | 1. | 23 | 8.7 | 8.9 |
| MODERATELY USEFUL | 2. | 151 | 57.4 | 67.4 |
| NOT USEFUL | 3. | 61 | 23.2 | 91.1 |
| IRRELEVANT | 4. | 23 | 8.7 | 100.0 |
| NO RESPONSE | 0. | 5 | 1.9 | 100.0 |
| | TOTAL | 263 | 100.0 | |
| | MEAN 2.326 | | | |
| | | MEDIAN 2.202 | | |

| nosuppac | | nonsupv | | involvement | | pac | | prep | | #57 | |
|---------------------|-------|---------|----------|-------------|----------|-------|-------|-------|---------|-------|-------|
| CATEGORY | LABEL | CODE | ABSOLUTE | RELATIVE | ADJUSTED | CUM | FREQ | (PCT) | FREQ | (PCT) | CUM |
| LITTLE NC INVCLVEMT | | 1. | 31 | 11.8 | 11.9 | 11.9 | 11.9 | | 11.9 | | 11.9 |
| UNDERSTAND PAC USES | | 2. | 181 | 68.8 | 69.6 | 81.5 | 81.5 | | 81.5 | | 81.5 |
| THOROUGH UNDERSTAND | | 3. | 48 | 18.3 | 18.5 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | | 100.0 |
| NO RESPONSE | | 0. | 3 | 1.1 | MISSING | 100.0 | 100.0 | | MISSING | | 100.0 |
| | | TOTAL | 263 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | | | | | |
| | | MEAN | 2.065 | MEDIAN | | 2.047 | | | | | |

| CLASSIME | | DEMO | | CLASSIFICATION | | SIMPLER | | #58 | |
|----------------|-------|-------|----------|----------------|----------|---------|-------|-------|-------|
| CATEGORY | LABEL | CODE | ABSOLUTE | RELATIVE | ADJUSTED | CUM | FREQ | (PCT) | CUM |
| TRUE | | 1. | 187 | 11.1 | 11.9 | 11.9 | 11.9 | | 11.9 |
| PARTIALLY TRUE | | 2. | 52 | 19.8 | 20.0 | 31.9 | 31.9 | | 31.9 |
| NOT TRUE | | 3. | 12 | 4.6 | 4.6 | 36.5 | 36.5 | | 36.5 |
| DON'T KNOW | | 4. | 9 | 3.4 | 3.5 | 40.0 | 40.0 | | 40.0 |
| NO RESPONSE | | 0. | 3 | 1.1 | MISSING | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 |
| | | TOTAL | 263 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | | | |
| | | MEAN | 1.396 | MEDIAN | | 1.195 | | | |

| CATEGORY LABEL | CLASIES | DEMO CLASS | TAKES LESS | TIME #59 | RELATIVE | ADJUSTED | CUM |
|----------------|---------|------------|------------|----------|----------|----------|-------|
| | | CODE | ABSOLUTE | FREQ | (PCT) | FREQ | FREQ |
| TRUE | | 1. | 206 | 8.3 | 9.2 | 9.2 | 9.2 |
| PARTIALLY TRUE | | 2. | 34 | 12.9 | 13.1 | 92.3 | 92.3 |
| NOT TRUE | | 3. | 10 | 3.8 | 3.8 | 96.2 | 96.2 |
| DON'T KNOW | | 4. | 10 | 3.8 | 3.8 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| NO RESPONSE | | 0. | 3 | 1.1 | MISSING | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| | | TOTAL | 263 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | |
| | | MEAN | 1.323 | | | | |
| | | MEDIAN | 1.131 | | | | |

| CATEGORY LABEL | CLASPAP | LESS PAPER FOR DEMO CLASS #60 | RELATIVE | ADJUSTED | CUM |
|----------------|---------|-------------------------------|----------|----------|-------|
| | | CODE | ABSOLUTE | FREQ | FREQ |
| TRUE | | 1. | 193 | 4.1 | 5.0 |
| PARTIALLY TRUE | | 2. | 38 | 14.4 | 5.0 |
| NOT TRUE | | 3. | 19 | 7.2 | 89.6 |
| DON'T KNOW | | 4. | 8 | 3.0 | 96.9 |
| NO RESPONSE | | 0. | 3 | 1.1 | 100.0 |
| | | TOTAL | 263 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| | | MEAN | 1.385 | | |
| | | MEDIAN | 1.167 | | |

| CATEGORY LABEL | CIASLCG | DEMO LEVELS ARE LOGICAL | #61 | RELATIVE | ADJUSTED | CUM |
|----------------|---------|-------------------------|----------|------------|------------|------------|
| | | CCODE | ABSOLUTE | FREQ (PCT) | FREQ (PCT) | FREQ (PCT) |
| TRUE | | 1. | 64 | 24.3 | 24.6 | 24.6 |
| PARTIALLY TRUE | | 2. | 147 | 55.9 | 56.5 | 81.2 |
| NCT TRUE | | 3. | 40 | 15.2 | 15.4 | 96.5 |
| DON'T KNOW | | 4. | 9 | 3.4 | 3.5 | 100.0 |
| NO RESPONSE | | 0. | 3 | 1.1 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | | TOTAL | 263 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| | | MEAN | 1.977 | | | |
| | | MEDIAN | 1.949 | | | |

| CATEGORY LABEL | CLASAUTH | DEMO CLASS AUTH IS RESPONSIBLE | #62 | RELATIVE | ADJUSTED | CUM |
|----------------|----------|--------------------------------|----------|------------|------------|------------|
| | | CCODE | ABSOLUTE | FREQ (PCT) | FREQ (PCT) | FREQ (PCT) |
| TRUE | | 1. | 144 | 54.8 | 55.6 | 55.6 |
| PARTIALLY TRUE | | 2. | 62 | 23.6 | 23.9 | 79.5 |
| NOT TRUE | | 3. | 14 | 5.3 | 5.4 | 84.9 |
| DON'T KNOW | | 4. | 39 | 14.8 | 15.1 | 100.0 |
| NO RESPONSE | | 0. | 4 | 1.5 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | | TOTAL | 263 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| | | MEAN | 1.799 | | | |
| | | MEDIAN | 1.399 | | | |

| CLASCON | CLASS CONFLICTS | REDUCED | UNDER DEMO #63 | | | | | | |
|----------------|-----------------|----------|----------------|----------|----------|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | RELATIVE | ADJUSTED | | | | |
| | | ABSOLUTE | | FREQ | FREQ | | | | |
| | CODE | FREQ | | (PCT) | (PCT) | | | | |
| CATEGORY LABEL | | | | | | | | | |
| TRUE | 1. | 142 | | 54.0 | 54.8 | | | | |
| PARTIALLY TRUE | 2. | 63 | | 24.0 | 24.3 | | | | |
| NOT TRUE | 3. | 21 | | 8.0 | 8.1 | | | | |
| DON'T KNOW | 4. | 33 | | 12.5 | 12.7 | | | | |
| NO RESPONSE | 0. | 4 | | 1.5 | MISSING | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | TOTAL | 263 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | | | | |
| | MEAN | 1.788 | | MEDIAN | 1.412 | | | | |

CUM
FREQ
(PCT)
54.8
79.2
87.3
100.0
100.0

| NOCONF | CLASS CONFLICTS | ARE ELIMINATED | #64 | | | | | | |
|----------------|-----------------|----------------|-----|----------|----------|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | RELATIVE | ADJUSTED | | | | |
| | | ABSOLUTE | | FREQ | FREQ | | | | |
| | CODE | FREQ | | (PCT) | (PCT) | | | | |
| CATEGORY LABEL | | | | | | | | | |
| TRUE | 1. | 32 | | 12.2 | 12.4 | | | | |
| PARTIALLY TRUE | 2. | 92 | | 35.0 | 35.5 | | | | |
| NOT TRUE | 3. | 98 | | 37.3 | 37.8 | | | | |
| DON'T KNOW | 4. | 37 | | 14.1 | 14.3 | | | | |
| NO RESPONSE | 0. | 4 | | 1.5 | MISSING | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | TOTAL | 263 | | 100.0 | 100.0 | | | | |
| | MEAN | 2.541 | | MEDIAN | 2.556 | | | | |

CUM
FREQ
(PCT)
12.4
47.9
85.7
100.0
100.0

| CATEGORY LABEL | CODE | ABSOLUTE FREQ | RELATIVE FREQ (PCT) | ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT) | CUM FREQ (PCT) |
|----------------|--------|------------------|------------------------|------------------------|-------------------|
| TRUE | 1. | 52 | 19.8 | 20.2 | 20.2 |
| PARTIALLY TRUE | 2. | 71 | 27.0 | 27.5 | 47.7 |
| NOT TRUE | 3. | 72 | 27.4 | 27.9 | 75.6 |
| DON'T KNOW | 4. | 63 | 24.0 | 24.4 | 100.0 |
| NO RESPONSE | 0. | 5 | 1.9 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | TOTAL | 263 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| | MEAN | 2.566 | | | |
| | MEDIAN | 2.583 | | | |

| CATEGORY LABEL | CCDE | ABSOLUTE FREQ | RELATIVE FREQ (PCT) | ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT) | CUM FREQ (PCT) |
|----------------|--------|------------------|------------------------|------------------------|-------------------|
| TRUE | 1. | 83 | 31.6 | 32.0 | 32.0 |
| PARTIALLY TRUE | 2. | 86 | 32.7 | 33.2 | 65.3 |
| NOT TRUE | 3. | 63 | 24.0 | 24.3 | 89.6 |
| DON'T KNOW | 4. | 27 | 10.3 | 10.4 | 100.0 |
| NO RESPONSE | 0. | 4 | 1.5 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | TOTAL | 263 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| | MEAN | 2.131 | | | |
| | MEDIAN | 2.041 | | | |

| CATEGORY LABEL | OTH TIME | OTHER USE IS MADE OF MY TIME #67 | ABSOLUTE FREQ | RELATIVE FREQ (PCT) | ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT) | CUM FREQ (PCT) |
|----------------|----------|----------------------------------|---------------|---------------------|---------------------|----------------|
| TRUE | | | 151 | 57.4 | 58.5 | 58.5 |
| PARTIALLY TRUE | | | 54 | 20.5 | 20.9 | 79.5 |
| NOT TRUE | | | 35 | 13.3 | 13.6 | 93.0 |
| DON'T KNOW | | | 18 | 6.8 | 7.0 | 100.0 |
| NO RESPONSE | | | 5 | 1.9 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | | | TOTAL 263 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| | | | MEAN 1.690 | MEDIAN 1.354 | | |

| CATEGORY LABEL | BETTER WORK RELATIONS UNDER DEMO #68 | ABSOLUTE FREQ | RELATIVE FREQ (PCT) | ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT) | CUM FREQ (PCT) |
|----------------|--------------------------------------|---------------|---------------------|---------------------|----------------|
| TRUE | | 83 | 31.6 | 32.0 | 32.0 |
| PARTIALLY TRUE | | 78 | 29.7 | 30.1 | 62.2 |
| NOT TRUE | | 49 | 18.6 | 18.9 | 81.1 |
| DON'T KNOW | | 49 | 18.6 | 18.9 | 100.0 |
| NO RESPONSE | | 4 | 1.5 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | | TOTAL 263 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| | | MEAN 2.247 | MEDIAN 2.096 | | |

| CATEGORY LABEL | FMAPROD | PMAS ARE MORE PRODUCTIVE #69 | ABSOLUTE | RELATIVE | ADJUSTED | CUM |
|----------------|---------|------------------------------|--------------|------------|------------|------------|
| | | CCDE | FREQ | FREQ (PCT) | FREQ (PCT) | FREQ (PCT) |
| TRUE | | 1. | 70 | 26.6 | 27.0 | 27.0 |
| PARTIALLY TRUE | | 2. | 78 | 29.7 | 30.1 | 57.1 |
| NOT TRUE | | 3. | 71 | 27.0 | 27.4 | 84.6 |
| DON'T KNOW | | 4. | 40 | 15.2 | 15.4 | 100.0 |
| NO RESPONSE | | 0. | 4 | 1.5 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | | | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- |
| | | TOTAL | 263 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| | | MEAN 2.313 | MEDIAN 2.263 | | | |

| CATEGORY LABEL | DEMCLRE | LONG RANGE PLANNING #70 | ABSOLUTE | RELATIVE | ADJUSTED | CUM |
|----------------|---------|-------------------------|--------------|------------|------------|------------|
| | | CCDE | FREQ | FREQ (PCT) | FREQ (PCT) | FREQ (PCT) |
| INCREASED | | 1. | 32 | 12.2 | 13.1 | 13.1 |
| ABOUT THE SAME | | 2. | 175 | 66.5 | 71.4 | 84.5 |
| DECREASED | | 3. | 14 | 5.3 | 5.7 | 90.2 |
| DON'T KNOW | | 4. | 24 | 9.1 | 9.8 | 100.0 |
| NO RESPONSE | | 0. | 18 | 6.8 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | | | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- |
| | | TOTAL | 263 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| | | MEAN 2.122 | MEDIAN 2.017 | | | |

| DEMOREC | | RECRUITMENT & SELECTION #71 | | ADJUSTED | | CUM | |
|----------------|------|-----------------------------|-------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| CATEGORY LABEL | CCDE | ABSOLUTE FREQ | RELATIVE (PCT) | FREQ (PCT) | FREQ (PCT) | FREQ (PCT) | FREQ (PCT) |
| INCREASED | 1. | 21 | 8.0 | 8.4 | 8.4 | 8.4 | 8.4 |
| ABOUT THE SAME | 2. | 200 | 76.0 | 79.7 | 88.0 | 88.0 | 88.0 |
| DECREASED | 3. | 12 | 4.6 | 4.8 | 92.8 | 92.8 | 92.8 |
| DON'T KNOW | 4. | 18 | 6.8 | 7.2 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| NO RESPONSE | 0. | 12 | 4.6 | MISSING | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| | | TOTAL | 263 | 100.0 | | | |
| | | MEAN 2.108 | MEDIAN 2.023 | | | | |

| CLASPREP | | PREPARING PACS #72 | | ADJUSTED | | CUM | |
|----------------|------|--------------------|-------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| CATEGORY LABEL | CCDE | ABSOLUTE FREQ | RELATIVE (PCT) | FREQ (PCT) | FREQ (PCT) | FREQ (PCT) | FREQ (PCT) |
| INCREASED | 1. | 16 | 6.1 | 6.4 | 6.4 | 6.4 | 6.4 |
| ABOUT THE SAME | 2. | 33 | 12.5 | 13.1 | 19.5 | 19.5 | 19.5 |
| DECREASED | 3. | 189 | 71.9 | 75.3 | 94.8 | 94.8 | 94.8 |
| DON'T KNOW | 4. | 13 | 4.9 | 5.2 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| NO RESPONSE | 0. | 12 | 4.6 | MISSING | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| | | TOTAL | 263 | 100.0 | | | |
| | | MEAN 2.793 | MEDIAN 2.905 | | | | |

CLASNEG NEGOTIATING PACS W PERSONNEL #73

| CATEGORY LABEL | CCDE | ABSOLUTE FREQ | RELATIVE FREQ (PCT) | ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT) | CUM FREQ (PCT) |
|----------------|------------|------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|
| INCREASED | 1. | 8 | 3.0 | 3.2 | 3.2 |
| ABOUT THE SAME | 2. | 61 | 23.2 | 24.3 | 27.5 |
| DECREASED | 3. | 152 | 57.8 | 60.6 | 88.0 |
| DON'T KNOW | 4. | 30 | 11.4 | 12.0 | 100.0 |
| NO RESPONSE | 0. | 12 | 4.6 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | TOTAL | 263 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| | MEAN 2.813 | | MEDIAN 2.872 | | |

| CATEGORY LABEL | CCDE | ABSOLUTE FREQ | RELATIVE FREQ (PCT) | ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT) | CUM FREQ (PCT) |
|----------------|------------|------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|
| INCREASED | 1. | 178 | 67.7 | 70.9 | 70.9 |
| ABOUT THE SAME | 2. | 42 | 16.0 | 16.7 | 87.6 |
| DECREASED | 3. | 17 | 6.5 | 6.8 | 94.4 |
| DON'T KNOW | 4. | 14 | 5.3 | 5.6 | 100.0 |
| NO RESPONSE | 0. | 12 | 4.6 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | TOTAL | 263 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| | MEAN 1.470 | | MEDIAN 1.205 | | |

| EMFDEV | EMPLOYEE DEVELOPMENT & OJT #75 | ABSOLUTE | RELATIVE | ADJUSTED | CUM |
|----------------|--------------------------------|----------|--------------|------------|------------|
| CATEGORY LABEL | CODE | FREQ | FREQ (PCT) | FREQ (PCT) | FREQ (PCT) |
| INCREASED | 1. | 72 | 27.4 | 28.8 | 28.8 |
| ABOUT THE SAME | 2. | 155 | 58.9 | 62.0 | 90.8 |
| DECREASED | 3. | 7 | 2.7 | 2.8 | 93.6 |
| DCN'T KNCW | 4. | 16 | 6.1 | 6.4 | 100.0 |
| NO RESPONSE | 0. | 13 | 4.9 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | TOTAL | 263 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| | MEAN 1.868 | | MEDIAN 1.842 | | |

| PERFREV | REVIEWING PERFORMANCE MONITORING #76 | ABSOLUTE | RELATIVE | ADJUSTED | CUM |
|----------------|--------------------------------------|----------|--------------|------------|------------|
| CATEGORY LABEL | CODE | FREQ | FREQ (PCT) | FREQ (PCT) | FREQ (PCT) |
| INCREASED | 1. | 203 | 77.2 | 81.2 | 81.2 |
| ABOUT THE SAME | 2. | 30 | 11.4 | 12.0 | 93.2 |
| DECREASED | 3. | 7 | 2.7 | 2.8 | 96.0 |
| DON'T KNCW | 4. | 10 | 3.8 | 4.0 | 100.0 |
| NO RESPONSE | 0. | 13 | 4.9 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | TOTAL | 263 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| | MEAN 1.296 | | MEDIAN 1.116 | | |

| PAYDEC | | PAY DECISIONS, AWARDS & PRB #77 | | ADJUSTED | | CUM | |
|----------------|------|---------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| CATEGORY LABEL | CCDE | ABSOLUTE FREQ | RELATIVE FREQ (PCT) | FREQ (PCT) | FREQ (PCT) | FREQ (PCT) | FREQ (PCT) |
| INCREASED | 1. | 167 | 63.5 | 66.8 | 66.8 | 66.8 | 66.8 |
| ABOUT THE SAME | 2. | 54 | 20.5 | 21.6 | 88.4 | 88.4 | 88.4 |
| DECREASED | 3. | 15 | 5.7 | 6.0 | 94.4 | 94.4 | 94.4 |
| DON'T KNOW | 4. | 14 | 5.3 | 5.6 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| NO RESPONSE | 0. | 13 | 4.9 | MISSING | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| TOTAL | | 263 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | | |
| MEAN 1.504 | | MEDIAN 1.249 | | | | | |

| ERDISCP | | EMPLOYEE RELATIONS & DISCIPLINE #78 | | ADJUSTED | | CUM | |
|----------------|------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| CATEGORY LABEL | CODE | ABSOLUTE FREQ | RELATIVE FREQ (PCT) | FREQ (PCT) | FREQ (PCT) | FREQ (PCT) | FREQ (PCT) |
| INCREASED | 1. | 52 | 19.8 | 20.8 | 20.8 | 20.8 | 20.8 |
| ABOUT THE SAME | 2. | 156 | 59.3 | 62.4 | 83.2 | 83.2 | 83.2 |
| DECREASED | 3. | 11 | 4.2 | 4.4 | 87.6 | 87.6 | 87.6 |
| DON'T KNOW | 4. | 31 | 11.8 | 12.4 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| NO RESPONSE | 0. | 13 | 4.9 | MISSING | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| TOTAL | | 263 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | | |
| MEAN 2.084 | | MEDIAN 1.968 | | | | | |

| SETOBJ | SETTING OBJECTIVES PLANNING #81 | ABSOLUTE | RELATIVE | ADJUSTED | CUM |
|-------------------|---------------------------------|----------|------------|------------|------------|
| | CCODE | FREQ | FREQ (PCT) | FREQ (PCT) | FREQ (PCT) |
| CATEGORY LABEL | | | | | |
| HIGHLY BENEFICIAL | 1. | 101 | 38.4 | 39.0 | 39.0 |
| BENEFICIAL | 2. | 138 | 52.5 | 53.3 | 92.3 |
| NOT IMPORTANT | 3. | 18 | 6.8 | 6.9 | 99.2 |
| DETRIMENTAL | 4. | 1 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 99.6 |
| VERY DETRIMENTAL | 5. | 1 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 100.0 |
| NO RESPONSE | 0. | 4 | 1.5 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | TOTAL | 263 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

MEAN 1.699 MEDIAN 1.70 /

| MONITOR | MONITORING PERFORMANCE REVIEWS #82 | ABSOLUTE | RELATIVE | ADJUSTED | CUM |
|-------------------|------------------------------------|----------|------------|------------|------------|
| | CCODE | FREQ | FREQ (PCT) | FREQ (PCT) | FREQ (PCT) |
| CATEGORY LABEL | | | | | |
| HIGHLY BENEFICIAL | 1. | 89 | 33.8 | 34.4 | 34.4 |
| BENEFICIAL | 2. | 150 | 57.0 | 57.9 | 92.3 |
| NOT IMPORTANT | 3. | 18 | 6.8 | 6.9 | 99.2 |
| DETRIMENTAL | 4. | 1 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 99.6 |
| VERY DETRIMENTAL | 5. | 1 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 100.0 |
| NO RESPONSE | 0. | 4 | 1.5 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | TOTAL | 263 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

MEAN 1.745 MEDIAN 1.770

| ANRGTG | YEAR-END PERFORMANCE RATING #83 | ADJUSTED | CUM |
|-------------------|---------------------------------|------------|------------|
| | ABSOLUTE | FREQ (PCT) | FREQ (PCT) |
| CATEGORY LABEL | | | |
| HIGHLY BENEFICIAL | 1. | 26.3 | 26.3 |
| BENEFICIAL | 2. | 63.7 | 90.0 |
| NOT IMPORTANT | 3. | 6.6 | 96.5 |
| DETRIMENTAL | 4. | 2.7 | 99.2 |
| VERY DETRIMENTAL | 5. | 0.8 | 100.0 |
| NO RESPONSE | 0. | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | TOTAL | 100.0 | |
| | MEAN 1.880 | | |
| | MEDIAN 1.873 | | |

| RATEDEF | DEMO RATING DEFINITIONS #84 | ADJUSTED | CUM |
|-------------------|-----------------------------|------------|------------|
| | ABSOLUTE | FREQ (PCT) | FREQ (PCT) |
| CATEGORY LABEL | | | |
| HIGHLY BENEFICIAL | 1. | 7.4 | 7.4 |
| BENEFICIAL | 2. | 58.5 | 65.9 |
| NOT IMPORTANT | 3. | 20.9 | 86.8 |
| DETRIMENTAL | 4. | 12.0 | 98.8 |
| VERY DETRIMENTAL | 5. | 1.2 | 100.0 |
| NO RESPONSE | 0. | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | TOTAL | 100.0 | |
| | MEAN 2.411 | | |
| | MEDIAN 2.228 | | |

| PAYLINK | PERFORMANCE EVAL | LINKAGE | W PAY #85 | RELATIVE | ADJUSTED | CUM |
|-------------------|------------------|----------|-----------|----------|----------|-------|
| | | | | FREQ | FREQ | FREQ |
| | | | | (PCT) | (PCT) | (PCT) |
| CATEGORY LABEL | | ABSOLUTE | | | | |
| HIGHLY BENEFICIAL | 1. | FREQ | | 17.1 | 17.4 | 17.4 |
| BENEFICIAL | 2. | 45 | | 42.2 | 43.0 | 60.5 |
| NOT IMPORTANT | 3. | 111 | | 9.1 | 9.3 | 69.8 |
| DETRIMENTAL | 4. | 24 | | 21.3 | 21.7 | 91.5 |
| VERY DETRIMENTAL | 5. | 56 | | 8.4 | 8.5 | 100.0 |
| NO RESPONSE | 0. | 22 | | 1.9 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | | 5 | | | | |
| | | --- | | --- | --- | --- |
| | | TOTAL | 263 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| | | MEAN | 2.609 | | | |
| | | | | MEAN | 2.257 | |

| MGTREV | MANAGEMENT REVIEW PROCESS #86 | RELATIVE | ADJUSTED | CUM |
|-------------------|-------------------------------|----------|----------|-------|
| | | FREQ | FREQ | FREQ |
| | | (PCT) | (PCT) | (PCT) |
| CATEGORY LABEL | | | | |
| HIGHLY BENEFICIAL | 1. | 20 | 7.6 | 7.8 |
| BENEFICIAL | 2. | 156 | 59.3 | 68.2 |
| NOT IMPORTANT | 3. | 22 | 20.2 | 88.8 |
| DETRIMENTAL | 4. | 7 | 8.7 | 97.3 |
| VERY DETRIMENTAL | 5. | 5 | 1.9 | 100.0 |
| NO RESPONSE | 0. | | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | | --- | --- | --- |
| | | TOTAL | 263 | 100.0 |
| | | MEAN | 2.380 | |
| | | | | MEAN |
| | | | | 2.199 |

| SUBSUFV | HOW MUCH YOU KNOW ABOUT WORK #87 | ABSOLUTE | RELATIVE | ADJUSTED | CUM |
|----------------|----------------------------------|----------|----------|------------|------------|
| CATEGORY LABEL | CCODE | FREQ | (PCT) | FREQ (PCT) | FREQ (PCT) |
| MORE | 1. | 94 | 35.7 | 37.3 | 37.3 |
| SAME | 2. | 155 | 58.9 | 61.5 | 98.8 |
| LESS | 3. | 3 | 1.1 | 1.2 | 100.0 |
| NO RESPONSE | 0. | 11 | 4.2 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | TOTAL | 263 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| | MEAN | 1.639 | MEDIAN | 1.706 | |

| DEMOCOM | HOW MUCH EXPECTATIONS COMMUNICATED #88 | ABSOLUTE | RELATIVE | ADJUSTED | CUM |
|----------------|--|----------|----------|------------|------------|
| CATEGORY LABEL | CODE | FREQ | (PCT) | FREQ (PCT) | FREQ (PCT) |
| MORE | 1. | 164 | 62.4 | 65.1 | 65.1 |
| SAME | 2. | 87 | 33.1 | 34.5 | 99.6 |
| LESS | 3. | 1 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 100.0 |
| NO RESPONSE | 0. | 11 | 4.2 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | TOTAL | 263 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| | MEAN | 1.353 | MEDIAN | 1.268 | |

| EMPKNOW | EMPLOYEES KNOW WHAT'S EXPECTED #89 | RELATIVE FREQ (PCT) | ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT) | CUM FREQ (PCT) |
|----------------|------------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|----------------|
| CATEGORY LABEL | ABSOLUTE FREQ | | | |
| MORE | 174 | 66.2 | 69.3 | 69.3 |
| SAME | 74 | 28.1 | 29.5 | 98.8 |
| LESS | 3 | 1.1 | 1.2 | 100.0 |
| NO RESPONSE | 12 | 4.6 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | TOTAL 263 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| | MEAN 1.319 | MEDIAN 1.221 | | |

| PAPERREQ | PAPER REQUIRED FOR PERF PLANS #91 | RELATIVE FREQ (PCT) | ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT) | CUM FREQ (PCT) |
|----------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|----------------|
| CATEGORY LABEL | ABSOLUTE FREQ | | | |
| INSUFFICIENT | 5 | 1.9 | 2.0 | 2.0 |
| ABOUT RIGHT | 183 | 69.6 | 72.3 | 74.3 |
| EXCESSIVE | 65 | 24.7 | 25.7 | 100.0 |
| NO RESPONSE | 10 | 3.8 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | TOTAL 263 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| | MEAN 2.237 | MEDIAN 2.164 | | |

| LRELAN | | LONG RANGE PLANNING #92 | | RELATIVE | | ADJUSTED | | CUM | |
|-------------------|------|-------------------------|------|----------|---------|----------|-------|-------|-------|
| CATEGORY LABEL | CCDE | ABSOLUTE | FREQ | (PCT) | FREQ | (PCT) | FREQ | (PCT) | FREQ |
| HIGHLY BENEFICIAL | 1. | 12 | 12 | 4.6 | 4.7 | 4.7 | 48.6 | 48.6 | 48.6 |
| BENEFICIAL | 2. | 113 | 113 | 43.0 | 46.3 | 46.3 | 94.9 | 94.9 | 94.9 |
| NOT IMPORTANT | 3. | 119 | 119 | 45.2 | 5.1 | 5.1 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| DETRIMENTAL | 4. | 13 | 13 | 4.9 | MISSING | MISSING | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| NO RESPONSE | 0. | 6 | 6 | 2.3 | | | | | |
| TOTAL | | 263 | 263 | 100.0 | | | | | |
| MEAN 2.518 | | MEDIAN 2.529 | | | | | | | |

| MPWRREQ | | DETERMINING MANPOWER REQUIREMENTS #93 | | RELATIVE | | ADJUSTED | | CUM | |
|-------------------|------|---------------------------------------|------|----------|---------|----------|-------|-------|-------|
| CATEGORY LABEL | CODE | ABSOLUTE | FREQ | (PCT) | FREQ | (PCT) | FREQ | (PCT) | FREQ |
| HIGHLY BENEFICIAL | 1. | 11 | 11 | 4.2 | 4.3 | 4.3 | 41.1 | 41.1 | 41.1 |
| BENEFICIAL | 2. | 95 | 95 | 36.1 | 36.8 | 36.8 | 97.7 | 97.7 | 97.7 |
| NOT IMPORTANT | 3. | 146 | 146 | 55.5 | 56.6 | 56.6 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| DETRIMENTAL | 4. | 6 | 6 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| NO RESPONSE | 0. | 5 | 5 | 1.9 | MISSING | MISSING | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| TOTAL | | 263 | 263 | 100.0 | | | | | |
| MEAN 2.570 | | MEDIAN 2.658 | | | | | | | |

| CATEGORY | WORKSCH | WORK SCHEDULING #94 | | | ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT) | CUM FREQ (PCT) |
|-------------------|---------|---------------------|------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|
| | | CCDEF | ABSOLUTE FREQ | RELATIVE FREQ (PCT) | | |
| HIGHLY BENEFICIAL | | 1. | 15 | 5.7 | 5.8 | 5.8 |
| BENEFICIAL | | 2. | 98 | 37.3 | 38.0 | 43.8 |
| NOT IMPORTANT | | 3. | 137 | 52.1 | 53.1 | 96.9 |
| DETRIMENTAL | | 4. | 8 | 3.0 | 3.1 | 100.0 |
| NO RESPONSE | | 0. | 5 | 1.9 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | | TOTAL | 263 | 100.0 | | |
| | | MEAN 2.535 | | | | |
| | | | MEDIAN 2.617 | | | |

| CATEGORY | SPONREP | REPORTS TO SENIOR MGMT SPONSORS #95 | | | ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT) | CUM FREQ (PCT) |
|-------------------|---------|-------------------------------------|------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|
| | | CODE | ABSOLUTE FREQ | RELATIVE FREQ (PCT) | | |
| HIGHLY BENEFICIAL | | 1. | 15 | 5.7 | 5.8 | 5.8 |
| BENEFICIAL | | 2. | 118 | 44.9 | 45.7 | 51.6 |
| NOT IMPORTANT | | 3. | 119 | 45.2 | 46.1 | 97.7 |
| DETRIMENTAL | | 4. | 6 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 100.0 |
| NO RESPONSE | | 0. | 5 | 1.9 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | | TOTAL | 263 | 100.0 | | |
| | | MEAN 2.450 | | | | |
| | | | MEDIAN 2.466 | | | |

| TRANEEED | IDENTIFY EMPLOYEES TRAINING NEEDS #96 | | | | |
|-------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|
| CATEGORY LABEL | CODE | ABSOLUTE FREQ | RELATIVE FREQ (PCT) | ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT) | CUM FREQ (PCT) |
| HIGHLY BENEFICIAL | 1. | 35 | 13.3 | 13.6 | 13.6 |
| BENEFICIAL | 2. | 155 | 58.9 | 60.1 | 73.6 |
| NOT IMPORTANT | 3. | 68 | 25.9 | 26.4 | 100.0 |
| NO RESPONSE | 0. | 5 | 1.9 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | TOTAL | 263 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| | MEAN 2.128 | | MEDIAN 2.106 | | |

| EMPROB | DEALING WITH EMPLOYEE PROBLEMS #97 | | | | |
|-------------------|------------------------------------|------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|
| CATEGORY LABEL | CODE | ABSOLUTE FREQ | RELATIVE FREQ (PCT) | ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT) | CUM FREQ (PCT) |
| HIGHLY BENEFICIAL | 1. | 42 | 16.0 | 16.3 | 16.3 |
| BENEFICIAL | 2. | 149 | 56.7 | 57.8 | 74.0 |
| NOT IMPORTANT | 3. | 63 | 24.0 | 24.4 | 98.4 |
| DETIRIMENTAL | 4. | 3 | 1.1 | 1.2 | 99.6 |
| VERY DETRIMENTAL | 5. | 1 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 100.0 |
| NO RESPONSE | 0. | 5 | 1.9 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | TOTAL | 263 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| | MEAN 2.116 | | MEDIAN 2.084 | | |

FINPRED PREDICTING FINANCIAL REQUIREMENTS #98

| CATEGORY LABEL | CCODE | ABSOLUTE FREQ | RELATIVE FREQ (PCT) | ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT) | CUM FREQ (PCT) |
|-------------------|-------|------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|
| HIGHLY BENEFICIAL | 1. | 7 | 2.7 | 2.7 | 2.7 |
| BENEFICIAL | 2. | 38 | 14.4 | 14.9 | 17.6 |
| NOT IMPORTANT | 3. | 205 | 77.9 | 80.4 | 98.0 |
| DET RIMENTAL | 4. | 3 | 1.1 | 1.2 | 99.2 |
| VERY DET RIMENTAL | 5. | 2 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 100.0 |
| NO RESPONSE | 0. | 8 | 3.0 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | TOTAL | 263 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

MEAN 2.824 MEDIAN 2.902

OVERPERF MY SUPERVISORY PERFORMANCE #99

| CATEGORY LABEL | CCODE | ABSOLUTE FREQ | RELATIVE FREQ (PCT) | ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT) | CUM FREQ (PCT) |
|-------------------|-------|------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|
| HIGHLY BENEFICIAL | 1. | 44 | 16.7 | 17.3 | 17.3 |
| BENEFICIAL | 2. | 159 | 60.5 | 62.4 | 79.6 |
| NOT IMPORTANT | 3. | 43 | 16.3 | 16.9 | 96.5 |
| DET RIMENTAL | 4. | 7 | 2.7 | 2.7 | 99.2 |
| VERY DET RIMENTAL | 5. | 2 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 100.0 |
| NO RESPONSE | 0. | 8 | 3.0 | MISSING | 100.0 |
| | TOTAL | 263 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

MEAN 2.075 MEDIAN 2.025

| PREFDEMC I PREFER THE DEMO ENVIRONMENT #100 | | RELATIVE | | ADJUSTED | | CUM | |
|---|-------|------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| CATEGORY LABEL | CCODE | ABSOLUTE FREQ | FREQ (PCT) | FREQ (PCT) | FREQ (PCT) | FREQ (PCT) | FREQ (PCT) |
| YES | 1. | 204 | 77.6 | 80.6 | 80.6 | 80.6 | 80.6 |
| NO | 2. | 49 | 18.6 | 19.4 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| NO RESPONSE | 0. | 10 | 3.8 | MISSING | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| TOTAL | | 263 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | | |
| MEAN 1.194 | | MEDIAN 1.120 | | | | | |

| VARIABLE | PAGE | POSITIONAL INDEX | VARIABLE | PAGE | VARIABLE | PAGE | | |
|-----------|------|------------------|----------|-----------|----------|----------|----|--|
| PAYPLAN | 6 | REASONA | 30 | PACPURPD | 54 | DEMOIMP | 78 | |
| SUPV | 7 | REASONB | 31 | PACUSE | 55 | MISSCONT | 79 | |
| ENTRSUPV | 8 | REASONC | 32 | NOSUPPAC | 56 | SETOBJ | 80 | |
| LEVEL | 9 | REASOND | 33 | CIASSIMP | 57 | MONITOR | 81 | |
| WRITEPD | 10 | HOWUSE | 34 | CLASLES | 58 | ANNRTG | 82 | |
| PDHOURS A | 11 | NCNSUPV | 35 | CLASPAP | 59 | RATEDEF | 83 | |
| PDHOURS E | 12 | WRITEBY | 36 | CLASLOG | 60 | PAYLINK | 84 | |
| PDHOURS C | 13 | PREPHRSA | 37 | CLASAUTH | 61 | MGTREV | 85 | |
| PDHOURS D | 14 | PREPHRSB | 38 | CLASCON | 62 | SUBSUPV | 86 | |
| PDHOURS E | 15 | PREPHRSC | 39 | NOCONF | 63 | DEMOCOM | 87 | |
| PDDAYSA | 16 | PREPHRSD | 40 | PMORE | 64 | EMPKNOW | 88 | |
| PDDAYSB | 17 | APPDAYS A | 41 | DEMOCCLAS | 65 | PAPERREQ | 89 | |
| PDDAYSC | 18 | APPDAYS B | 42 | OTHTIME | 66 | LRPLAN | 90 | |
| PDDAYSD | 19 | APPDAYS C | 43 | BETREL | 67 | MPWRRREQ | 91 | |
| PDDAYSE | 20 | APPDAYS D | 44 | PMAPROD | 68 | WORKSCH | 92 | |
| NUMPDSA | 21 | PACSYRA | 45 | DEMOLRP | 69 | SPONREP | 93 | |
| NUMPDSB | 22 | PACSYRB | 46 | DEMORFC | 70 | TRANRED | 94 | |
| NUMPDS C | 23 | PACSYRC | 47 | CLASPREP | 71 | EMPROB | 95 | |
| NUMPDS D | 24 | PACSYRD | 48 | CLASNEG | 72 | FINPRERF | 96 | |
| NUMPDS E | 25 | PERINACC | 49 | PLANWORK | 73 | OVERPERF | 97 | |
| INACCPDS | 26 | USEPACS | 50 | EMPDEV | 74 | PREFDEMO | 98 | |
| HCWINACC | | 27 | FACPURPA | 51 | PERFREV | 75 | | |
| REASINACC | | 28 | PACPURPB | 52 | PAYDEC | 76 | | |
| USEPDS | | 29 | PACPURPC | 53 | ERDISCP | 77 | | |

| VARIABLE | PAGE | ALPHABETIC INDEX | | VARIABLE | PAGE | VARIABLE | PAGE |
|-----------|------|------------------|----|-----------|----------|----------|------|
| ANNRTG | 82 | FINPRE | 96 | PACSYRA | 45 | PREFDEMO | 98 |
| APPDAYS A | 41 | HOWINACC | 27 | PACSYRB | 46 | PREPHRSA | 37 |
| APPDAYS E | 42 | HOWUSE | 34 | PACSYRC | 47 | PREPHRSE | 38 |
| APPDAYS C | 43 | INACCPDS | 26 | PACSYRD | 48 | PREPHRSC | 39 |
| APPDAYS D | 44 | LEVEL | 9 | PACUSE | 55 | PREPHRSD | 40 |
| BETREL | 67 | LRFLAN | 90 | PAPERREQ | 89 | RATEDEF | 83 |
| CLASAUTH | 61 | MGTRREV | 85 | PAYDEC | 76 | REASINAC | 28 |
| CLASCON | 62 | MISSCONF | 79 | PAYLINK | 84 | REASONA | 30 |
| CLASLES | 58 | MONITOR | 81 | PAYPLAN | 6 | REASONB | 31 |
| CLASLOG | 60 | MEWRREQ | 91 | PDDAYS A | 16 | REASONC | 32 |
| CLASNEG | 72 | NOCONF | 63 | PDDAYS B | 17 | REASOND | 33 |
| CLASPAP | 59 | NONSUPV | 35 | PDDAYS C | 18 | SETOBJ | 80 |
| CLASPREF | 71 | NONSUPPAC | 56 | PDDAYS D | 19 | SPONREP | 93 |
| CLASSIMP | 57 | NUMPDSA | 21 | PDDAYS E | 20 | SUBSUPV | 86 |
| DEMOCCLAS | 65 | NUMPDSB | 22 | PDHOURS A | 11 | SUPV | 7 |
| DEMOCOM | 87 | NUMPDS C | 23 | PDHOURS B | 12 | TRANEEED | 94 |
| DEMOLMP | 78 | NUMPDS D | 24 | PDHOURS C | 13 | USEPACS | 50 |
| DEMOLRP | 69 | NUMPDS E | 25 | PDHOURS D | 14 | USEPDS | 29 |
| DEMOMREC | 70 | OTHTIME | 66 | PDHOURS E | 15 | WORKSCH | 92 |
| EMPDEV | 74 | OVERPERF | 97 | PERFREY | 75 | WRITTEY | 36 |
| EMPKNOW | 88 | PACPURPA | 51 | PERINACC | 49 | WRITTEPD | 10 |
| EMPROB | | PACPURPB | | 52 | PLANWORK | | |
| ENTRSUPV | | PACPURPC | | 53 | PMAPROD | | |
| ERDISCP | | PACPURPD | | 54 | PMAPROE | | |

LIST OF REFERENCES

1. United States Congress, Public Law 95-454, The Civil Service Reform Act of 1978, Title VI, U.S. Code of Federal Regulations, 13 October 1978.
2. Naval Weapons Center, China Lake, Administrative Publication, The Demonstration Project: An Experiment in Federal Personnel Management, 1981.
3. Naval Weapons Center, China Lake, Administrative Publication 230, Revision 2, NWC Performance Evaluation System Handbook, July 1982.
4. Newman, J. E. and Hinrichs, J. R., Performance Evaluation for Professional Personnel, Work in America Institute, 1980.
5. Levinson, Priscilla, A Guide for Improving Performance Evaluation, Subarea of Policies and Standards, U.S. Civil Service Commission, 1977.
6. American Management Association, Research Study 74, Objectives and Standards: An Approach to Planning and Control, by Ernest C. Miller, 1966.
7. Latham, G.P. and Wexley, K.N., Increasing Productivity Through Performance Appraisal, Addison-Wesley, 1981.
8. Lawler, Edward E., Pay and Organization Development, Addison-Wesley, 1981.
9. Naval Civilian Personnel Command, NAVSO P-3600, Merit Pay System Administrative Guide, Rev. 5/82.
10. Naval Postgraduate School, NPS-55Gh73061, Design of an Operational Personnel Development and Evaluation System, by W.H. Githens, R.S. Elster, G.L. Musgrave, and J.W. Creighton, June 1973.
11. Brynildsen, R.D., Consensus Ranking--A Cornerstone for Human Resource Management, paper prepared for Kaiser Aluminum and Chemical Corp., Oakland, California, 1982.

12. University of Southern California, School of Public Administration, Naval Laboratory Demonstration Project Phase I Report on Basic Analyses of Experimental and Control Laboratory Data: Survey of Job-Related Attitudes and Job Satisfaction Measures, 1980.
13. United States Office of Personnel Management, OPM-46-81, Evaluation of the Navy Demonstration Project for the Office of Personnel Management, by Coopers and Lybrand, 1982.
14. Naval Weapons Center, China Lake, Administrative Publications, Composite Results of Demonstration Project Survey, 1979, 1980, 1981, 1982, 1983.
15. Simon, Julian L., Basic Research Methods in Social Science: The Art of Empirical Investigation, 2nd Ed., Random House, 1978.
16. Peters, Thomas J., and Waterman, Jr., Robert H., In Search of Excellence, Harper and Row, 1982.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Andrews, Kenneth R., The Concept of Corporate Strategy, Irwin, Inc., Rev. 1980.
- Bennis, W. G., and others, The Planning of Change, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Third Ed., 1976.
- Conover, W. J., Practical Nonparametric Statistics, 2nd Ed., Wiley, 1980.
- Cummings, L. L. and Schwab, D. P., Performance in Organizations: Determinants and Appraisal, Scott-Foresman, 1973.
- DeVries, David L., and others, Performance Appraisal on the Line, Wiley, 1981.
- French, Wendell L., and Bell, Jr., Cecil H., Organization Development, Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1978.
- Kellogg, Marion S., What to Do About Performance Appraisal, Rev. Ed., AMACOM, 1975.
- Lazer, R. I. and Wikstrom, W. S., Appraising Managerial Performance: Current Practices and Future Directions, The Conference Board, 1977.
- Sloma, Richard S., How to Measure Managerial Performance, MacMillan, 1980.

INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST

| | No. Copies |
|---|------------|
| 1. Defense Technical Information Center Cameron Station Alexandria, Virginia 22314 | 2 |
| 2. Library, Code 0142 Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, California 93940 | 2 |
| 3. CDR W. R. Bishop, USN, Code 54 Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, California 93940 | 1 |
| 4. Dr. G. K. Jayaram, Code 54 Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, California 93940 | 1 |
| 5. Assistant for Analysis, Evaluation (NMPC-6C) Human Resource Management & Personal Affairs Dept. Navy Military Personnel Command Washington, D.C. 20370 | 1 |
| 6. Director, Human Resource Management Division (NMPC-62) Human Resource Management & Personal Affairs Dept. Navy Military Personnel Command Washington, D.C. 20370 | 1 |
| 7. Director for HRM Plans and Policy (OP-150) Human Resource Management Division Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Manpower, Personnel & Training) Washington, D.C. 20370 | 1 |
| 8. Commanding Officer Human Resource Management School Naval Air Station Memphis Millington, Tennessee 38054 | 1 |

9. Commanding Officer 1
Human Resource Management Center London
Box 23
FPO, New York 09510
10. Commanding Officer 1
Human Resource Management Center
5621-23 Tidewater Drive
Norfolk, Virginia 23509
11. Commanding Officer 1
Human Resource Management Center
Pearl Harbor, Hawaii 96860
12. Commanding Officer 1
Human Resource Management Center
Naval Training Center
San Diego, California 92133
13. Commanding Officer 1
Organizational Effectiveness Center & School
Fort Ord, California 93941
14. Commanding Officer 1
Human Resource Management Center
Commonwealth Building, Room 1144
1300 Wilson Blvd.
Arlington, Virginia 22209
15. Mr. George Steinhauer 1
Chief of Naval Operations (OP 141)
Department of the Navy
Washington, D.C. 20350
16. Ms. Kathleen Connelley 1
U.S. Office of Personnel Management
Office of Performance Management
1900 E. St. NW
Washington, D.C. 20415
17. Civilian Personnel Officer (Code 14) 1
Naval Ocean Systems Command
San Diego, California 92152
18. Head, Systems Analysis (Code 16) 1
Naval Ocean Systems Command
San Diego, California 92152

- | | | |
|-----|--|---|
| 19. | Civilian Personnel Officer (Code 09) Naval Weapons Center China Lake, California 93555 | 1 |
| 20. | Demonstration Project Manager (Code 0902) Naval Weapons Center China Lake, California 93555 | 1 |
| 21. | Technical Director (Code 01) Naval Weapons Center China Lake, California 93555 | 1 |
| 22. | Head, Ordnance Systems Department (Code 32) Naval Weapons Center China Lake, California 93555 | 1 |
| 23. | Director of Navy Laboratories Naval Material Command (MAT-05L) Department of the Navy Arlington, Virginia 20360 | 1 |
| 24. | Dr. Gene Bretton U.S. General Accounting Office (PSDD) 441 G. St. NW Washington, D.C. 20548 | 1 |
| 25. | Yvonne E. Williams Civilian Personnel Department (Code 092) Naval Weapons Center China Lake, California 93555 | 1 |

Thesis
W62425 Williams
c.1

201592

The impact of the
demonstration project
on managers at the
Naval Weapons Center,
China Lake.

Thesis
W62425 Williams
c.1

201592

The impact of the
demonstration project
on managers at the
Naval Weapons Center,
China Lake.

thesW62425

The impact of the demonstration project



3 2768 001 90102 8

DUDLEY KNOX LIBRARY